

**CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION**

45 FREMONT, SUITE 2000
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105-2219
VOICE AND TDD (415) 904-5200
FAX (415) 904-5400

F-5a

Appeal Filed:	April 5, 2000
49 th Day:	Waived
Staff:	PTI - SF
Staff Report:	July 18, 2002
Hearing Date:	August 8, 2002

STAFF REPORT: REGULAR CALENDAR

APPLICATION FILE NO.:	A-2-PAC-00-10 and 2-00-009
LOCAL PERMIT NO.:	CDP-130-98
APPLICANT:	City of Pacifica
PROJECT LOCATION:	528 to 572 Esplanade Drive, Pacifica, San Mateo County (APNs 009-131-010, 009-131-030, 009-161-010 through 009-161-150) (Exhibits 1-3)
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:	Construction of a 700-foot long, 40-foot wide, 20-foot tall rock revetment previously constructed under emergency conditions on the face and at the foot of a coastal bluff.
APPELLANTS:	Coastal Commissioners Wan and Potter
SUBSTANTIVE FILE DOCUMENTS:	See Appendix A.
STAFF RECOMMENDATION:	Approval of De Novo Permit with Conditions; Approval of Regular Permit with Conditions

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This permit application and appeal of local government permit approval concerns a 700-foot long, 40-foot wide, 20-foot tall rock revetment located on the face and at the foot of a coastal bluff fronting Esplanade Drive in the City of Pacifica. The revetment was constructed in 1998 pursuant to Emergency Permit 1-98-048-G for the purpose of protecting two remaining houses on the bluff top west of Esplanade Drive, Esplanade Drive itself, infrastructure located in the public right-of-way, and eleven houses east of Esplanade Drive.

The coastal development permit approved by the City, which is the subject of the appeal, is for the portion of the project located on the beach and bluff face above the mean high tide line within the City's permit jurisdiction.¹ For this portion of the development, the City's Local Coastal Program (LCP) is the standard of review. A separate permit application for the portion of the project on tidally-influenced shoreline located within the Commission's original coastal development permit jurisdiction

¹ The City approved the project as built, with no conditions.

A-2-PAC-00-010, 2-00-009 (City of Pacifica)

is also before the Commission. The standard of review for the portion of the project in the Commission's original permit jurisdiction consists of the relevant policies of the Coastal Act.

At its May 10, 2001 hearing, the Commission opened the hearing on both the appeal and the permit application and determined, with respect to the appeal of the local government permit, that the appeal raised a substantial issue of consistency with the City's certified LCP. After public hearing and discussion of issues raised by the project, the Commission voted to continue the hearing of this permit application and appeal and directed staff to address more fully project-related issues, including: (1) revetment drainage, (2) project alternatives, including smaller revetment designed to protect only two remaining houses, and (3) impacts to sand supply and mitigation.

In the interim, to address these issues, the City has provided new information and evaluation of the revetment and its potential impacts including in particular the following documents: (1) Supplemental Reply prepared by the City's consultant, Cotton, Shires & Associates, Inc. ("CSA"), dated September 18, 2001, (2) a Supplemental Response prepared by CSA, dated February 2002, (3) Background Documentation for Coastal Bluff Ecosystem Restoration, prepared by L.C. Lee and Associates ("LCLA"), dated March 7, 2002, (4) a letter from the City's consultant, Skelly Engineering, dated November 29, 2001, evaluating sand supply and littoral processes at the project site, and (5) a letter from Ken Lindberg, President, Power Engineering Contractors, dated November 13, 2001, providing a cost estimate for revetment removal.

Over the last several decades, the coastal bluff in the project area has been subject to episodic retreat of as much as 30 to 60 feet in one winter storm season. Based on the slope stability analysis provided by the City's consultants and documented, episodic retreat rates in this location, bluff-top structures including the two remaining homes west of Esplanade Drive, Esplanade Drive itself and infrastructure within the public right-of-way are currently in danger from erosion and shoreline retreat. Without the revetment in place, these structures could be undermined within one to two storm seasons, depending on the severity of storm waves.

The City has augmented its analysis of project alternatives to provide an evaluation of alternatives including managed retreat, construction of a vertical seawall, sand replenishment, and a revetment of reduced length protecting only the two remaining homes west of Esplanade Drive. Each of these alternatives would involve substantial costs and significant environmental impacts which make these alternatives practically infeasible. In particular, the managed retreat, reduced footprint and sand replenishment alternatives would leave the bluff partially or completely exposed, resulting in eventual loss of property and structures on the bluff top. A vertical seawall would involve additional, substantial costs and greater environmental impacts resulting from additional excavation at the foot of the bluff for the deeper, seawall footing. These considerations together render the proposed revetment the least environmentally damaging feasible alternative. With respect to sand supply and mitigation, the Commission engineer concurs with the conclusions of the City's engineering consultant that the amount of sand which would be supplied to the beach from the eroding bluff behind the revetment is negligible compared to the amount of sand supplied to the beach by longshore transport from creeks and eroding bluffs north and south of the project site.

At the May 2001 hearing, the Commission raised concerns about the direction of stormwater drainage over the bluff top and the project site. Runoff from the bluff top and Esplanade Drive is currently routed through a drain pipe running under the access road at the southern end of the revetment and discharging onto the beach below. **Special Condition 5** requires the City to provide a Revised Drainage Plan redirecting the runoff in this away from the blufftop and the beach below.

A-2-PAC-00-010, 2-00-009 (City of Pacifica)

The staff recommends that the Commission find the project as conditioned consistent with the relevant policies of the City's LCP and Coastal Act and approve the coastal development permits for both the portion of the revetment located in the City's permit jurisdiction and the Commission's permit jurisdiction, subject to the conditions below.

Special Condition 1 requires the City to inspect and maintain the project regularly to minimize the risk of hazards and visual impacts associated with the project. Monitoring includes the inspection of the development using specific criteria to identify potential problems. Maintenance of the revetment includes the removal or redeposit of dislodged rock as soon as possible after displacement occurs and the removal of debris and trash from the revetment. **Special Condition 1** further requires the submission of a monitoring report at least once a year to evaluate the condition and performance of the revetment and recommend repair and maintenance.

Despite its hazardous nature, the City has voluntarily chosen to carry out the proposed project. **Special Condition 2** therefore requires the City to assume the risk of injury and damage from such hazards in connection with the permitted development, waive any claim of liability against the Commission for such losses, and indemnify and hold harmless the Commission if third parties bring an action against the Commission as a result of any hazards associated with the proposed project.

As proposed, the revetment and fill buttress will occupy 32,000 sq. ft. of public, sandy beach. **Special Condition 3** requires the City to provide public access improvements on 24,000 sq. ft. of public bluff-top property to mitigate the loss of public sandy beach caused by the placement of the development. Public access improvements on the bluff top must provide for pedestrians, bicyclists, and persons of limited mobility within one year of issuance of the CDPs. To fully offset the 32,000 square feet of lost public beach, **Special Condition 3** additionally requires the City to provide additional opportunities for public access on up to 8,000 additional square feet of property in the event the City acquires additional property on the bluff top in the project area.

Because the project as constructed includes modifications not authorized by the Commission under the emergency permit, the project is an alleged violation. **Special Condition 4** requires the City to satisfy all prior to issuance requirements within 90 days of Commission action on this coastal development permit application. Failure to comply with **Special Condition 4** may result in the institution of enforcement action under the provisions of Chapter 9 of the Coastal Act.

Special Condition 5 requires the City to submit a Revised Drainage Plan for the Executive Director's approval prior to permit issuance for re-routing the existing drainage from the bluff top away from the beach and to redirect bluff-top drainage consistent with the approved plan within 180 days of permit issuance.

1.1 Local Government Action

On March 20, 2000, the City of Pacifica approved Coastal Development Permit CDP-130-98 to permanently authorize a rock revetment installed pursuant to an emergency permit approved by the City on March 9, 1998. The project was approved as built with no conditions. The City's 10-day local appeal period ended on March 30, 2000. No local appeals were filed.

1.2 Filing of Appeal

The Commission received the Notice of Final Local Action from the City of Pacifica on March 22, 2000, and the Commission's appeal period began on March 23, 2000, the first working day following Commission receipt of the Notice of Final Local Action. In accordance with Section 13110 of the

A-2-PAC-00-010, 2-00-009 (City of Pacifica)

Commission's regulations, the 10-working-day appeal period ran from March 23 to April 6, 2000. On April 5, 2000, within the 10-working-day Commission appeal period, the appellants (Commissioners Wan and Potter) filed their appeal. On April 6, 2000, the Commission sent notice of the appeal to the City of Pacifica.

In accordance with Section 13112 of the Commission's regulations, the City must provide to the Executive Director of the Commission a copy of the file containing all relevant documents and materials regarding the subject permit. On April 6, 2000, Commission staff requested all relevant documents and materials regarding the subject permit from the City. On April 12, 2000, the Commission received a letter from the City confirming that the local record, with the exception of the Pacifica Planning Commission's March 20, 2000 meeting minutes enclosed with the letter, had previously been furnished to the Coastal Commission in conjunction with CDP Application No. 2-00-009, mailed on March 22, 2000 for the portion of the project within the Coastal Commission's original permit jurisdiction.²

On April 12, 2000, Commission staff prepared a staff report on the appeal for the Commission's consideration at its May 12, 2000 hearing. The City waived its right under Section 30261 to a hearing being set within 49 days of the filing of the appeal on May 10, 2000. The original appeal hearing date of May 12, 2000 was postponed to allow City staff to respond to the issues raised in the April 20, 2000 Commission staff report.

On May 10, 2001, the matter was re-agendized and the Commission found that the appeal raised a substantial issue with respect to the conformance of the development as approved by the City of Pacifica with the policies of the certified LCP and the public access policies of the Coastal Act, and opened de novo hearing of the portion of the project located in the City's permit jurisdiction together with hearing of the coastal development permit application for the portion of the same project located in the Commission's original permit jurisdiction.

1.3 Standard of Review

For the de novo review of local government approval of the portion of the project located in the City's permit jurisdiction, the standard of review consists of the policies of the City's certified LCP and the public access and public recreation policies of the Coastal Act. For the portion of the project located in the Commission's original permit jurisdiction, the standard of review consists of the policies of Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act.

There are separate motions for the portion of the project in the Commission's appeal jurisdiction and the Commission's retained permit jurisdiction. The Commission must vote separately on each item. Because the de novo review and the original Commission jurisdiction permit have two different standards of review, the findings in Section 2.0 below incorporate both standards of review. Because the City's Land Use Plan (LUP) incorporates the policies of the Coastal Act verbatim, each LUP policy corresponds to a Coastal Act policy and is so referenced in the findings. Although the project spans two jurisdictions and must be reviewed under two, separate coastal development permit applications, the development functions as a single, inseparable structure and is recommended for Commission action at one time.

² Because the lower portion of the revetment is located in the Commission's original permit jurisdiction, the City submitted CDP Application No. 2-00-009 to the Commission to authorize the lower portion of the revetment.

1.4 Appeal Process

After certification of local coastal programs, the Coastal Act provides for limited appeals to the Coastal Commission of certain local government actions on coastal development permits, pursuant to Coastal Act Section 30603.

Coastal Act Section 30603 provides, in applicable part, that an action taken by a local government on a coastal development permit application may be appealed to the Coastal Commission for certain kinds of developments, including the approval of developments located within certain geographic appeal areas, such as those located between the sea and the first public road paralleling the sea, or within 300 feet of the mean high tide line or inland extent of any beach or top of the seaward face of a coastal bluff, or in a sensitive coastal resource area or those located within 100 feet of any wetland, estuary, or stream. Furthermore, developments approved by coastal counties may be appealed if they are not designated the “principal permitted use” under the certified LCP. Finally, developments that constitute a major public works or a major energy facility may be appealed, whether they are approved or denied by the local government.

The Esplanade revetment project is located between the sea and Esplanade Drive, the first public road paralleling the sea, and within 300 feet of the mean high tide line and the top of the seaward face of a coastal bluff, and thus meets the Commission’s appeal criteria pursuant to Section 30603 of the Coastal Act.

Section 30603 of the Coastal Act limits the grounds for an appeal of a project located between the sea and the first public road paralleling the sea to an allegation that the development does not conform to the standards set forth in the certified LCP or the public access policies set forth in the Coastal Act. On May 10, 2001, the Commission found that the appeal raised a substantial issue with respect to the conformance of the development as approved by the City of Pacifica with the policies of the certified LCP and the public access policies of the Coastal Act, and opened de novo hearing of the portion of the project located in the City’s permit jurisdiction together with hearing of the coastal development permit application for the portion of the same project located in the Commission’s original permit jurisdiction.

1.0 STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

1.1 Motion and Resolution for Coastal Development Permit No. A-2-PAC-00-010

The staff recommends that the Commission approve Coastal Development Permit No. A-2-PAC-00-010 subject to the conditions in Sections 1.3 and 1.4 below.

Motion:

I move that the Commission approve Coastal Development Permit No. A-2-PAC-00-010 subject to conditions pursuant to the staff recommendation.

Staff Recommendation of Approval:

Staff recommends a **YES** vote. Passage of this motion will result in approval of the permit as conditioned and adoption of the following resolution and findings. The motion passes only by affirmative vote of a majority of the Commissioners present.

Resolution to Approve the Permit:

The Commission hereby approves a coastal development permit for the proposed development and adopts the findings set forth below on the grounds that the development as conditioned will be in

A-2-PAC-00-010, 2-00-009 (City of Pacifica)

conformity with the policies of the certified LCP and the public access and recreation policies of Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act. Approval of the permit complies with the California Environmental Quality Act because either 1) feasible mitigation measures and/or alternatives have been incorporated to substantially lessen any significant adverse effects of the development on the environment, or 2) there are no further feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that would substantially lessen any significant adverse impacts of the development on the environment.

1.2 Motion and Resolution for Coastal Development Permit No. 2-00-009

The staff recommends that the Commission approve Coastal Development Permit No. 2-00-009 subject to the conditions in Sections 1.3 and 1.4 below.

Motion:

I move that the Commission approve Coastal Development Permit No. 2-00-009 subject to conditions pursuant to the staff recommendation.

Staff Recommendation of Approval:

Staff recommends a **YES** vote. Passage of this motion will result in approval of the permit as conditioned and adoption of the following resolution and findings. The motion passes only by affirmative vote of a majority of the Commissioners present.

Resolution to Approve the Permit:

The Commission hereby approves a coastal development permit for the proposed development and adopts the findings set forth below on the grounds that the development as conditioned will be in conformity with the policies of Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act. Approval of the permit complies with the California Environmental Quality Act because either 1) feasible mitigation measures and/or alternatives have been incorporated to substantially lessen any significant adverse effects of the development on the environment, or 2) there are no further feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that would substantially lessen any significant adverse impacts of the development on the environment.

1.3 Standard Conditions

1. Notice of Receipt and Acknowledgment. The permit is not valid and development shall not commence until a copy of the permit, signed by the permittee or authorized agent, acknowledging receipt of the permit and acceptance of the terms and conditions, is returned to the Commission office.
2. Expiration. If development has not commenced, the permit will expire two years from the date on which the Commission voted on the application. Development shall be pursued in a diligent manner and completed in a reasonable period of time. Application for extension of the permit must be made prior to the expiration date.
3. Interpretation. Any questions of intent of interpretation of any condition will be resolved by the Executive Director or the Commission.
4. Assignment. The permit may be assigned to any qualified person, provided assignee files with the Commission an affidavit accepting all terms and conditions of the permit.

A-2-PAC-00-010, 2-00-009 (City of Pacifica)

5. Terms and Conditions Run with the Land. These terms and conditions shall be perpetual, and it is the intention of the Commission and the permittee to bind all future owners and possessors of the subject property to the terms and conditions.

1.4 Special Conditions Applicable to A-2-PAC-00-010 and 2-00-009

1. Monitoring and Maintenance.

- A. By May 1 of every year for the life of the structure as well as required under the provision of Special Condition 1(B) below, the permittee shall submit a monitoring report that has been prepared by a licensed geologist, or civil or geotechnical engineer.
1. Each monitoring report shall contain the following:
- An evaluation of the condition and performance of the approved shoreline protection device, including an assessment of whether any weathering or damage has occurred that could adversely impact future performance of the device,
 - An analysis of erosion trends, annual retreat, or rate of retreat of the bluff based upon measurements and in conformance with the approved monitoring plan,
 - A description of any migration or movement of rock that has occurred on the site, and
 - Recommendations for repair, maintenance, modifications, or other work to the device, including methods and materials to be used.
- B. The permittee shall repair and maintain the approved shoreline protection. If a monitoring report contains recommendations for repair, maintenance, or other work, the permittee shall, within 30 days of receiving the recommendation, contact the Coastal Commission North Central Coast District Office to determine whether such work requires a coastal development permit or permit amendment. If a permit or permit amendment is required, the permittee shall, within 90 days of receiving the recommendation, apply for a permit or permit amendment to undertake the repair and maintenance. If a monitoring report concludes that the shoreline protection structure or any portion of the aforementioned structure is unsafe for use, the permittee shall, immediately, and in no event later than 30 days of discovery of the hazard, apply for an amendment to this coastal development permit to remedy the hazard, which may include removal of the threatened portion of the shoreline protection device.
- C. The permittee shall examine the revetment at least once before the beginning of the rainy season, at least once six months following the beginning of the rainy season, and immediately after all major storms as conditions permit. The permittee shall look for the following signs of potential revetment failure or impacts to coastal resources:
- Excessive scour in front of the revetment following significant storm events,
 - Dislodged rocks or stones seaward of the revetment,
 - Gaps or exposed underlayer material,
 - Slumping or rotation of revetment, and
 - Settlement of rock into underlying sand.
- If the permittee finds that any condition listed above exists at the project site, the permittee shall hire a licensed geologist, or civil or geotechnical engineer to prepare a monitoring report consistent with the requirements of Special Condition 1(A)1 above.
- D. The permittee shall remove, redeposit, or reposition any rock or material that becomes dislodged or displaced from the approved shoreline protection as soon as possible after such

A-2-PAC-00-010, 2-00-009 (City of Pacifica)

displacement occurs. The permittee shall contact the Coastal Commission North Central Coast District Office immediately to determine whether such activities require a coastal development permit or permit amendment.

- E. The permittee shall remove any materials not explicitly authorized pursuant to this coastal development permit, including but not limited to debris, trash, or other materials from the shoreline protection device and shall take all necessary measures to discourage the placement of such material on the project site.
- F. The permittee shall inspect the 6-inch perforated pipe placed under the fill buttress at the base of the bluff face at least once a year and maintain the proper function of the pipe by cleaning the pipe with a snake and/or water pressure, if appropriate.
- G. The permittee shall employ Best Management Practices (BMPs) to prevent erosion and geologic instability of the fill buttress. The BMPs shall include without limitation:
 - 1. Installation of erosion control fabric,
 - 2. Vegetation of fill buttress on bluff top using native plant species adapted to the project site conditions,
 - 3. Installation of signs and/or barriers to prohibit access onto the fill buttress,
 - 4. Prohibition of any concentrated flows of surface water from natural drainageways, graded swales, downspouts, or other sources, and
 - 5. Stabilization of the face of the buttress using bioengineering techniques when feasible.
- H.
 - 1. The permittee shall maintain the access road constructed on the project site in a condition that:
 - a. Allows access for vehicles and heavy equipment from Esplanade Drive to the base of the bluff for maintenance purposes,
 - b. Does not contribute to erosion of the bluff, and
 - c. Does not exhibit signs of erosion.
 - 2. In no case shall the permittee pave the access road.

2. Assumption of Risk, Waiver of Liability and Indemnity.

- A. By acceptance of this permit, the applicant acknowledges and agrees (i) that the site may be subject to hazards from landslide, bluff retreat, erosion, and earth movement; (ii) to assume the risks to the applicant and the property that is the subject of this permit of injury and damage from such hazards in connection with this permitted development; (iii) to unconditionally waive any claim of damage or liability against the Commission, its officers, agents, and employees for injury or damage from such hazards; and (iv) to indemnify and hold harmless the Commission, its officers, agents, and employees with respect to the Commission's approval of the project against any and all liability, claims, demands, damages, costs (including costs and fees incurred in defense of such claims), expenses, and amounts paid in settlement arising from any injury or damage due to such hazards.

B. PRIOR TO ANY CONVEYANCE OF THE PROPERTY THAT IS THE SUBJECT OF THIS COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT, the applicant shall submit to the Executive Director for review and approval documentation demonstrating that the landowner(s) has executed and recorded a deed restriction, in a form and content acceptable to the Executive Director over the parcel(s) governed CDP by A-2-PAC-00-010 and CDP 2-00-009: (1) indicating that, pursuant to this permit, the California Coastal Commission has authorized development on the subject property, subject to terms and conditions that restrict the use and enjoyment of that property (hereinafter referred to as the “Standard and Special Conditions”); and (2) imposing all Standard and Special Conditions of this permit as covenants, conditions and restrictions on the use and enjoyment of the Property. The deed restriction shall include a legal description of the parcel or parcels governed by CDP A-2-PAC-00-010 and CDP 2-00-009. The deed restriction shall also indicate that, in the event of an extinguishment or termination of the deed restriction for any reason, the Standard and Special Conditions of this permit shall continue to restrict the use and enjoyment of the subject property so long as either this permit or the development it authorizes - or any part, modification, or amendment thereof - remains in existence on or with respect to the subject property.

C. PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF THE COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT, the applicant shall submit a written agreement, in a form and content acceptable to the Executive Director, incorporating all of the above terms of this condition.

3. Public Access.

- A. *Prior to the issuance of the coastal development permit***, the applicant shall submit, for the review and approval of the Executive Director, a plan for the provision of public access improvements on the City-owned property at the top of the bluff of the project site at APNs 009-161-030 through 009-161-090 and 009-161-120 through 140, currently consisting of approximately 24,000 square feet, generally depicted on **Exhibit 8**.
1. A licensed geologist or geotechnical engineer shall determine:
 - a. the net developable area, as defined in the Pacifica Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan, of the property to accommodate public access purposes, and
 - b. the development setback from the edge of the bluff sufficient to protect the public access improvements for the design life of such improvements.
 2. The plan shall demonstrate that the City-owned public property on the top of the bluff will provide lateral access for pedestrians, bicycles, and persons of limited mobility within one year of issuance of this CDP.
 3. The public access improvements shall be sited and designed for accessibility by people of limited mobility to the maximum extent feasible.
 4. The public access improvements shall be sited and designed for compatibility with the natural character of the shoreline.
 5. The plan shall be at a large scale, such as 1” = 100’, and the applicant shall also provide a reduced, 8 ½” by 11” copy of the plan at the same scale showing the public access improvements.
 6. The public access improvements shall include, at a minimum, the following components:

A-2-PAC-00-010, 2-00-009 (City of Pacifica)

- a. a lateral access trail at least eight (8) feet wide and separated from the public road (Esplanade Drive), with the inland edge of the trail at least 10 feet from the occupied residences. The trail shall qualify as a Class I bikeway;
 - b. overlook point(s);
 - c. benches; and
 - d. signage identifying the location of vertical and lateral public accessways, bicycle routes, destination areas, environmentally sensitive habitat, and hazardous conditions. The signage shall use appropriate color, size, form, and material to be compatible with the natural appearance and character of the shoreline.
- B. The chain-link fence along the 500-block of Esplanade Drive shall be removed, and a new fence shall be located as close to the bluff edge as practicable while still providing for public safety. The new fence shall be of an open design, compatible with the natural character of the site, and shall not obstruct views.
- C. The fence separating all or portions of APN 009-161-140 from the adjacent City-owned property shall be removed. Any new fence proposed to separate City-owned from the adjacent private property at APN 009-074-030 shall require a coastal development permit.
- D. The permittees shall landscape the bluff-top public access area using appropriate native vegetation.
- E. In addition to the above-identified requirements of this condition, if the permittee acquires any additional property on the bluff top at APNs 009-161-010, 009-161-020, 009-161-100, and/or 009-161-110, all of which are generally depicted on **Exhibit 8**, with 90 days of acquiring any such additional property, the permittee shall submit, for the review and approval of the Executive Director, a plan for the provision of public access improvements so that at least 8,000 square feet of the 13,500 square feet of total property that can be acquired is improved, consistent with the requirements of Special Condition 3.
- F. The permittee shall undertake development in accordance with the approved final plan. The permittee shall complete construction of the public access improvements required by Special Condition 3.A and shown on the approved final plan within one year from the issuance of this coastal development permit. Any proposed changes to the approved final plan shall be reported to the Executive Director. No changes to the approved final plan shall occur without a Commission amendment to this coastal development permit unless the Executive Director determines that no amendment is legally required.
4. Condition Compliance.

Within 90 days of Commission action on this coastal development permit application, or within such additional time as the Executive Director may grant for good cause, the applicant shall satisfy all requirements specified in the conditions hereto that the applicant is required to satisfy prior to issuance of this permit. Failure to comply with this requirement may result in the institution of enforcement action under the provisions of Chapter 9 of the Coastal Act.

A-2-PAC-00-010, 2-00-009 (City of Pacifica)

5. Revised Bluff-top Drainage Plan.

A. Prior to the issuance of the coastal development permit, the applicant shall submit, for the review and approval of the Executive Director, a Revised Bluff-top Drainage Plan for redirecting existing drainage of runoff from the bluff-top area and Esplanade Drive away from the beach below the revetment. Runoff currently flowing to the beach shall be redirected to the municipal storm drain system or other suitable conduit and redirected to an outfall away from the beach.

B. Within 180 days of issuance of the coastal development permit, the applicant shall complete construction of a new or modified bluff-top drainage system redirecting drainage of runoff away from the beach below the bluff consistent with the terms and conditions of this permit and the plans approved in Section A of this Condition.

2.0 FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS FOR A-2-PAC-00-010 AND 2-00-009

2.1 Background

The project site has had rock revetments of various dimensions in place documented as early as March 1971. After storms in 1982 and 1983 eroded 33 feet of the bluff in the southern portion of the project area, the owners of private property in the 500 block of Esplanade Drive on the top of the bluff created an assessment district in order to construct a 1,650-foot long revetment with 28,000 tons of rock on the face and at the base of the bluff in 1984 to prevent erosion and protect existing residences. In 1983, Pacifica's City Council also made an effort to plan for integrated shoreline protection by passing a resolution endorsing a master plan for seawall construction for the area south of Manor Drive (the site of the approved project) to the southern end of Shoreview Avenue, a distance of about a half mile.

In 1997, the Executive Director issued Emergency Permit 1-97-84-G to the owners of private property at 528, 532, 536, and 540 Esplanade Drive to construct a 150-foot long, 12-foot high, and 1-foot wide reinforced concrete seawall/bluff retaining wall with a 6-foot deep foundation at the base of an eroding 60-foot high coastal bluff to protect four single-family residences. The owner of the residence at 544 Esplanade, immediately south of the aforementioned project, received Emergency Permit 1-98-003-G for the construction of a 50-foot long extension of the shoreline protection contemplated under Emergency Permit 1-97-84-G. The property owners had constructed the foundation and keyway and were in the process of applying for a regular coastal development permit (1-97-065) for a 20-foot high, 250-foot long cribblock bluff retaining wall at the time the 1998 storms began.

On February 2, 1998, the State experienced a series of heavy storms and flooding. On February 4, 1998, Governor Wilson declared a state of emergency for the State of California, and on February 9, 1998, President Clinton also declared a state of disaster.

The 1998 storms caused 40 to 60 feet of bluff erosion at the project site and left remnants of the destroyed rock revetment scattered across the public beach. The bluff retreat damaged several of the bluff-top residences on Esplanade Drive. As a result, during February and March 1998, the City Building Official determined that ten residences on the seaward side of Esplanade Drive were unsafe to occupy. The City, with Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) funds, purchased the ten condemned residences. On May 6, 1998, the City demolished seven of the ten condemned residences. The remaining three condemned residences were removed a year-and-a-half later, on October 18, 1999. Two residences, 528 and 532 Esplanade Drive, were not condemned and are still privately owned and occupied. In addition to these two properties, the undeveloped lots at 564 and 568 Esplanade Drive

A-2-PAC-00-010, 2-00-009 (City of Pacifica)

remain in private ownership. The City owns the other eight lots on the seaward side of Esplanade Drive (536, 540, 544, 548, 552, 556, 560, and 572 Esplanade Drive).

On March 9, 1998, the City approved an emergency permit for the construction of the revetment in the City's coastal permit jurisdiction. After the Commission staff received information requested from the City concerning the emergency project, on May 26, 1998, the Executive Director granted a separate emergency permit for the portion of the same revetment located seaward of the mean high tide line, within the Commission's original permit jurisdiction (Emergency Permit 1-98-048-G). The purpose of the revetment was to protect Esplanade Drive, utilities within the public right-of-way, and several remaining homes. Construction of the development began in June 1998 and was completed in October 1998. The City determined that the project is statutorily and categorically exempt from review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Sections 15269 (Emergency Projects) and 15302 (Replacement or Reconstruction) of the CEQA regulations (Title 14 CCR).

In May 1998, the Commission granted an emergency permit for the portion of the revetment in the Commission's permit jurisdiction. The emergency permit granted temporary authorization for the revetment, specifying that within 120 days of the date of the emergency permit, the City must apply to the Commission for a regular coastal development permit. In March 2000, the City submitted its coastal development permit application to the Commission for the permanent authorization of the portion of the revetment in the Commission's permit jurisdiction.

On March 20, 2000, the City approved regular Coastal Development Permit 130-98 for the portion of the project within the City's jurisdiction constructed under the City's 1998 emergency permit. The City's approval is currently before the Commission on appeal. On March 22, 2000, to fulfill the conditions of the Commission's emergency permit, the City submitted a follow-up application to the Coastal Commission to authorize the portion of the revetment in the Commission's jurisdiction.

2.2 Project Location

The project is located at the face and base of a 60- to 70-foot tall coastal bluff at 528 to 572 Esplanade Drive in the West Edgemar/Pacific Manor neighborhood of the City of Pacifica in San Mateo County (**Exhibits 1 and 2**). The corresponding Assessor Parcel Numbers are 009-131-010, 009-131-030, and 009-161-010 through 009-161-150 (**Exhibit 3**).

The revetment is located both within the City of Pacifica's permit jurisdiction and the Coastal Commission's original permit jurisdiction. The revetment is partially on the bluff face and partially on a public beach at the toe of the bluff.

The land use designation for the property on the beach (APNs 009-131-010 and 009-161-150) is Open Space. The Land Use Plan designates the bluff top and the bluff face behind the residential and formerly residential property (APNs 009-161-010 through -0140) as Low Density Residential. The bluff top and bluff face property (009-131-030) north of the residential property has a Medium Density Residential land use designation. Zoning for the bluff-top property is Single-Family Residential (R-1), the northernmost bluff-top property is Multiple-Family Residential (R-3.1) and property on the beach is Commercial Recreation (C-R). All of the properties are additionally zoned as Coastal Zone Combining District (CZ). The property is surrounded by existing single-family residential development to the east, vacant property zoned multi-family residential to the north, a recreational vehicle park to the south, and public beach and the Pacific Ocean to the west.

2.3 Project Description

As stated in Emergency Permit 1-98-048-G, issued by Commission staff on May 26, 1998, the shoreline protection project proposed by the City was to

[c]onstruct a rock revetment to protect Esplanade Drive and utilities as well as several remaining homes by placing approximately 23,000 tons of 2 to 8-ton rock (including remnants from the former rock revetment at the site to be reused and imported rock) on formational material covered with geotextile fabric, approximately 1,000 feet in length 40 feet wide, 20 to 60 feet high, and at a vertical slope of approximately two horizontal to one vertical.

The Executive Director and the City issued the emergency permits based on the above description to protect remaining residences, public property, above-ground and underground utilities and a public road all located on the top of the bluff from damage resulting from erosion of the coastal bluff.³

The project as constructed varies somewhat from the project described in the original plans approved under the emergency permit. As constructed, the revetment varies from the plans approved under the emergency permit as follows:

1. Decreased Revetment Length The revetment as constructed is approximately 700 feet long, 300 feet shorter than approved under the emergency permits.
2. Decreased Revetment Height The revetment as constructed is about 20 feet in height. The originally proposed revetment was described as 20 to 60 feet tall. The taller height included the engineered fill buttress and the underground foundation of the revetment.
3. Decreased Revetment Crest Width The revetment crest width was reduced from 12 feet to 6 feet at the 26-foot Mean Sea Level elevation, resulting in an approximately 15% decrease in the volume of rock approved under the emergency permits.
4. Changed Revetment Stone Size The April 2, 1998 *Engineering Assessment Report* by the City's engineering consultant states that the weight of the armor stone (the stone placed in the outer layers of the revetment) selected for design is in the range of 8- to 10-tons. Although the contractor originally could not obtain sufficient quantities of 8- to 10-ton revetment rock locally for the entire armor layers and the keyway, the contractor eventually located a quarry supplying 8-ton and larger stone. These stones were used to construct the keyway to support the revetment and most of the first armor layer. 5- to 7-ton stone was used in the first armor layer at elevations above approximately 18 feet Mean Sea Level (MSL). 5-ton armor stone was also placed on the tallest portions of the revetment, at or above 24 feet MSL. With the project engineer's approval, the contractor used 6- to 8-ton stone in the second armor layer. The size of the rocks was estimated visually.
5. Deletion of Hydraulaugers The revetment as built does not include the hydraulaugers originally proposed. Hydraulaugers are perforated pipes inserted into a hillside in order to improve drainage of ground water in potentially unstable slopes (Lawrence Berkeley Lab 1996). The plan approved

³ The Commission staff received the emergency permit application from the City for the revetment on March 20, 1998 and issued Emergency Permit 1-98-048-G on May 26, 1998. All of the twelve, original single-family residences on the seaward side of the 500 block of Esplanade Drive were standing at the time the City submitted the emergency permit application. Before the Executive Director issued the emergency permit, the City condemned and removed seven houses in 1998. The City removed three more houses from the bluff in 1999. Two single-family residences remain and are still occupied.

A-2-PAC-00-010, 2-00-009 (City of Pacifica)

under the emergency permits shows 29 100-foot long hydraugers installed into the bluff along the length of the revetment to increase the stability of the bluff. Because the City purchased the bluff-top properties and was not planning to reconstruct the single-family residences on the bluff, the hydraugers were eliminated from the plan.

6. Addition of Fill Buttress. During winter storms, a small cove formed at the southern end of the proposed project site. The City constructed an approximately 50-foot tall fill buttress on the face and at the base of the bluff to replace the material lost in this area and to stabilize the access road for maintenance purposes. The buttress construction consists of the placement of stones ranging in weight from 100 pounds to six tons and drainrock on Franciscan greenstone bedrock. Filter fabric was placed over the drainrock, and 11,000 cubic yards of fill, excavated during the construction of the revetment keyway was compacted to a 1.5:1 horizontal-to-vertical slope. The fill buttress extends the topographic top of slope (not the natural bluff edge) seaward by about ten feet. A six-inch perforated PVC pipe, surrounded by more drainrock runs laterally through the buttress about two feet above the stone and drainrock base. The pipe discharges to the revetment at the southern end of the buttress and opens at the northern end for maintenance. This development was not included in the project plans approved under the emergency permits.
7. Construction of Access Road. Although not shown on the plans approved under the emergency permits, the City constructed an access road from Esplanade Drive down the bluff face to the beach. The road was constructed during the excavation of the keyway and revetment for future maintenance and access to the beach by the City and thus was not used to access the site during the construction of the revetment. The road consists of an approximately 13-foot wide and 80-foot long unpaved slope and is located at the southern end of the revetment. The City constructed the access road by cutting the upper portion of the bluff and placing fill at the base of the bluff and on the revetment (a portion of the fill buttress) to create a 1.5:1 slope.
8. Drainage Improvements on Esplanade Drive. The as-built plans show an expanded system of drainage inlets from the intersection of Esplanade and Avalon Drives to the project area designed to convey street runoff to the base of the revetment.
9. Placement of base rock, concrete barrier, and fill on bluff top. The project includes the placement of 15,000 square feet of base rock within the Esplanade Drive right-of-way, 420 linear feet of concrete k-rail barrier on the west side of the Esplanade Drive about 40 feet from the bluff edge, and 1,300 cubic yards of fill on bluff-top parcel south of the intersection of Esplanade and Avalon Drives immediately west of the concrete k-rail barrier.

To construct the revetment, a keyway was excavated at the base of the bluff into Franciscan greenstone bedrock with a proposed minimum depth of five feet and minimum width of ten feet. Filter fabric was placed in the keyway and covered with 10- to 12-ton rock. Most rock placed on the first and outermost armor layer weighed from 8 to 10 tons, with some stones weighing up to 20 tons. 5- to 7-ton stones were placed in the first armor layer above about 18 feet MSL. The second armor layer consisted mainly of 6- to 8-ton stone. The innermost stones ranged in weight from 100 pounds to 5 tons. Rock used to construct the revetment was angular in shape, with the shortest dimension not exceeding one-third of the longest dimension, and made mainly of metaconglomerate, welded volcanic tuff, and graywacke sandstone.

A-2-PAC-00-010, 2-00-009 (City of Pacifica)

The City constructed the approved revetment under state- and federally-declared emergency conditions. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) funded the shoreline protection project to repair and stabilize the bluff damaged by severe wave action and subsurface water seepage during the 1998 El Niño storms. The approved revetment replaced the previous revetment constructed in 1983 that deteriorated over time by storm waves.

The City constructed the approved revetment to protect privately-owned residences, public property, public utilities, and a public road on the top of the bluff. Two privately-owned residences at 528 and 532 Esplanade Drive are located approximately 40 feet from the edge of the bluff. Eight of ten vacant lots on the seaward side of Esplanade Drive (536 to 560 Esplanade Drive, and 572 Esplanade Drive) were purchased by the City and are in public ownership. Overhead electricity and telephone cables are located about 50 feet from the bluff edge on the western side of Esplanade Drive. The City is currently considering relocating the overhead utilities underground on Esplanade Drive. The six-inch water line and eight-inch sewer pipe are located less than ten feet underground and about 55 and 60 feet respectively from the existing face of the bluff. The sewer line serves about 42 lots. Both pipes are located within the 60-foot Esplanade Drive right-of-way. Sixty-six properties convey water to a storm drainpipe under the street. The City believes that the underground utilities were installed during the construction of the original subdivision in the early 1950s.

Esplanade Drive, a public road, has a 60-foot wide right-of-way. After the construction of the project, the City reconfigured Esplanade Drive as a one-way northbound street. The one-way configuration of Esplanade Drive ranges from 40 to 80 feet from the bluff edge. The City installed a concrete "k-rail" barrier and a 5-foot tall chain-link fence in the former southbound lane, south of the two remaining houses at 528 and 532 Esplanade Drive, to prevent vehicles and the public from entering the bluff-top area.

As shown in the as-built plans, drainage of runoff from the bluff top and Esplanade and Avalon Drives within the project area is currently routed through a previously existing system of storm drains connecting to a culvert running through the revetment and emptying at the base of the revetment to the beach below.

2.4 Geologic Stability and Shoreline Erosion

Issue Summary

The revetment project was constructed under emergency conditions to protect an eroding coastal bluff to prevent further erosion of the bluff and protect existing bluff-top structures and does not create or contribute significantly to erosion or geologic instability of the site or its surroundings as required by LCP Policy 26 / Coastal Act Section 30253. However, the existing bluff-top drainage under the access the road and emptying onto the beach could contribute to beach erosion in front of the revetment inconsistent with LCP Policy 26 / Coastal Act Section 30253. The Commission finds that the question of proper site drainage is integral to the project and therefore imposes **Special Condition 5**, requiring the City to submit for the Executive Director's review and approval a Revised Drainage Plan prior to permit issuance for re-routing the existing drainage from the bluff top away from the beach and to redirect bluff-top drainage consistent with the terms and conditions of the permit and approved plan within 180 days of permit issuance. As conditioned, the Commission finds that the proposed project does not create or contribute significantly to erosion and conforms to the policies of the certified LCP and Coastal Act that assure structural integrity and geologic stability.

LCP and Coastal Act Policies

LCP Land Use Plan Policy 26 / Coastal Act Section 30253 in relevant part states:

New development shall:

- (1) Minimize risks to life and property in areas of high geologic, flood and fire hazard.*
- (2) Assure stability and structural integrity, and neither create nor contribute significantly to erosion, geologic instability, or destruction of the site or surrounding area or in any way require the construction of protective devices that would substantially alter natural landforms along bluffs and cliffs.*

...

Discussion

The design of the proposed revetment was originally based on 100-year recurrence interval for oceanographic conditions leading to coastal erosion. The City's engineering consultant assessed the oceanographic and geologic conditions of the site to develop the design criteria for the revetment in the pre-construction *Engineering Assessment Report* dated April 2, 1998. Based on conditions such as nearshore bathymetry, maximum possible still water elevation, wave height, beach slope, and bedrock foundation scour depth, to withstand a 100-year oceanographic condition (erosion) event, the engineering consultant recommended the construction of the revetment with 10-ton armor stone and a 14-foot crest width at the 26-foot MSL elevation. The engineering consultant also noted that a revetment designed to withstand 50-year oceanographic condition event would have a crest width of 12 feet at 26 feet MSL and an armor layer of 5-ton stone. To withstand 75-year oceanographic condition event, a crest width of 13 feet and armor stone size of about 8 tons is needed. The report states that "an armor stone size of 8 to 10 tons was selected for design."

As listed in Section 2.3 above, the revetment as constructed varies from the plans approved under the emergency permits. The effects of these changes on the stability of the proposed project are described below.

The revetment as constructed consists of 8 to 10-ton rock in the first armor layer and a crest width of six feet at the 26-foot MSL elevation. Some stones up to 20 tons in weight were placed in the first armor layer. The engineering consultant concluded that the reduction in crest width

may result in a small amount of water striking the bluff during an extreme (greater than 100-year recurrence interval) storm event. However, because the top of revetment is at elevation +26 MSL the water will have very little energy to erode the unprotected cliff face above the revetment. (Skelly 1998)

The revetment contains smaller armor stone in the second armor layer. The City's engineering consultant states that the use of smaller-than-specified armor stones in the second armor layer will not affect the performance of the revetment. The engineering consultant further remarks that the use of 5 to 7-ton stones as the first armor layer at elevations above +18 MSL is acceptable at elevations above +18 MSL because water forces are greatly reduced at elevations above +16 MSL. However, according to the City's engineering consultant, the use of smaller stones in the second armor layer and in the first armor layer at the top of the revetment may result in additional maintenance as a result of an increase in frequency of movement of dislodged stones movement under extreme storm conditions.

As proposed, the City's engineering consultant opines that the revetment should withstand a 75-year oceanographic condition event, but will likely suffer some damage during 100-year event. The Commission staff engineer has reviewed the engineering reports and plans for the as-built project and

A-2-PAC-00-010, 2-00-009 (City of Pacifica)

has determined that the revetment provides adequate shoreline protection to withstand 75 year oceanographic conditions. The Commission staff engineer emphasizes, however, that as built, the revetment may require more maintenance than a revetment designed to withstand 75-year or 100-year oceanographic condition event because it is designed to withstand less severe oceanographic conditions and will be subject to a greater frequency of dislodged stones.

Hydraugers intended to provide subsurface drainage of the bluff were not installed as part of the project. The City acknowledges that the use of hydraugers would increase the stability of the exposed bluff above the top of the revetment. However, the hydraugers were intended to improve the stability of the bluff to allow for the rebuilding of houses on the bluff top and were not considered essential to protect the adjacent public street or infrastructure. Since the City bought all but four of the bluff-top properties and contemplates the provision of passive public access instead of the construction of new houses on the bluff top, the hydraugers were eliminated from the plan.

As proposed, the revetment generally extends from 528 Esplanade Drive south to the portion of the bluff jutting seaward, a distance of approximately 700 feet. The revetment keyway has a minimum width of 10 feet and a minimum depth of 5 feet to ensure stability of the structure. The keyway ties into the existing bluff by curving inward at the northern end. This engineered design provides an angle to the revetment that eliminates wave uprush reflected from the revetment onto the adjacent unprotected bluffs. At the southern end, the keyway is cut into the Franciscan greenstone bedrock where the bluff forms a relatively erosion-resistant point. Thus, the design reduces the potential for the revetment to create or contribute significantly to erosion or geologic instability of the surrounding bluff.

As proposed, the fill buttress and the access road partially built on the buttress are engineered properly and do not create or contribute to further erosion of the bluff. The City's engineering consultant supervised the construction of the fill buttress to ensure adherence to design specifications. Compaction tests were conducted to certify that the fill was compacted to a minimum of 90% of the maximum dry density of the material. Furthermore, the buttress was designed and constructed at a 1.5:1 slope to preserve the maximum amount of in-place bluff material (CSA 1998). Because the buttress replaces lost bluff material, the buttress acts as a cover of the natural bluff that prevents further bluff erosion from occurring. In addition, **Special Condition 1** requires the City to maintain the fill buttress and access road and prevent any sloughing or erosion.

The intent of the proposed project is to reduce erosion of the bluff at the project site. Based on review of the geotechnical information provided by the City, the Commission staff engineer concurs with the City's engineering consultant that the design of the revetment is sufficient to achieve this purpose of reduction of bluff erosion. However, the existing configuration of bluff-top drainage through a storm drain system with outfall to the beach below the revetment could contribute to beach erosion, inconsistent with LUP Policy 26 / Coastal Act Section 30253. The Commission raised concerns about this drainage outfall at the May 2001 hearing. Runoff from the bluff top and Esplanade Avenue and Avalon Drive within the project area currently is routed through a previously existing system of storm drains connecting to a drain pipe running under the access road and emptying to the beach at the base of the revetment. Although the storm drain system and beach outfall existed prior to the construction of the revetment, the question of site drainage is integral to the revetment project approved by the City and must be addressed as part of the project. The existing drainage configuration could cause erosion of beach sand below the drainage outfall due to scour resulting from high winter runoff volumes. To address this potential for beach erosion, the Commission imposes **Special Condition 5**, which requires the City to submit for the Executive Director's approval a Revised Drainage Plan for the site prior to

A-2-PAC-00-010, 2-00-009 (City of Pacifica)

permit issuance. The revised Drainage Plan must re-route the existing drainage from the bluff top away from the beach below the revetment. **Special Condition 5** further requires the City to construct new or modified bluff-top drainage plan, consistent with the approved plan, within 180 days of permit issuance. So conditioned, the Commission finds that the proposed project does not create or contribute significantly to erosion and conforms to the policies of the certified LCP and Coastal Act that require new development to assure structural integrity and geologic stability.

The Commission staff engineer and geologist affirm that, as conditioned, the proposed project assures stability and structural integrity, and neither creates nor contributes significantly to erosion, geologic instability, or destruction of the site or the surrounding area, consistent with the requirements of LCP Land Use Plan Policy 26 / Coastal Act Section 30253. The Commission accordingly finds that the proposed project, as conditioned, is consistent with LCP Policy 26 / Coastal Act Section 30253.

Conclusion

The proposed revetment was constructed to prevent further erosion of a coastal bluff. By decreasing bluff retreat at the project site, the revetment protects two remaining private residences, a public road, public bluff-top property, and public-serving utilities from damage or destruction. The information presented by the City demonstrates that the proposed project will not create further erosion or instability of the bluff. Re-direction of bluff-top drainage away from the existing beach outfall consistent with the Revised Drainage Plan required by **Special Condition 5** assures that the project will also not contribute to beach erosion. Therefore, as conditioned, the Commission finds that the project assures stability and structural integrity and neither creates nor contributes significantly to erosion, geologic instability, or destruction of the site or the surrounding area and is consistent with LCP Policy 26 / Coastal Act Section 30253.

2.5 Shoreline Protection and Alternatives Analysis

Issue Summary

The proposed revetment is the least environmentally damaging feasible alternative that protects existing structures in danger from bluff retreat. The geotechnical information provided by the City considers all the necessary criteria for shoreline protection required by LUP Policy 16 / Coastal Act Section 30235 and indicates that the proposed project is required to protect existing structures in danger from erosion and designed to eliminate or mitigate impacts to local shoreline sand supply. However, the proposed project does not conform to the requirements of LCP Zoning Code Ordinance 9-4.4406 to provide maintenance. Therefore, **Special Condition 1** requires the City to maintain the revetment to remove or redeposit dislodged rock from the beach. As conditioned, the Commission finds that the proposed project conforms to the LCP and Coastal Act policies for development on the shoreline.

LCP and Coastal Act Policies

LCP Land Use Plan Policy 16 / Coastal Act Section 30235 states in applicable part:

Revetments, breakwaters, groins, harbor channels, seawalls, cliff retaining walls, and other such construction that alters natural shoreline processes shall be permitted when required to serve coastal-dependent uses or to protect existing structures or public beaches in danger from erosion, and when designed to eliminate or mitigate adverse impacts on local shoreline sand supply.

LCP Zoning Code Ordinance 9-4.4406 (Shoreline Protection) states in relevant part:

(c) Development standards. The following standards shall apply to all new development along the shoreline and on coastal bluffs.

- (1) alteration of the shoreline, including diking, dredging, filling, and placement or erection of a shoreline protection device, shall not be permitted unless the device has been designed to eliminate or mitigate adverse impacts on local shoreline sand supply and it is necessary to protect existing development or to serve coastal-dependent uses or public beaches in danger from erosion or unless, without such measures, the property at issue will be rendered undevelopable for any economically viable use;*

...

- (3) Required shoreline protection devices shall be designed and sited to consider and reflect:*

- (i) maximum expected wave height;*
- (ii) estimated frequency of overtopping;*
- (iii) normal and maximum tidal ranges;*
- (iv) projected erosion rates with and without a shoreline protection device;*
- (v) impact on adjoining properties;*
- (vi) design life of the device;*
- (vii) maintenance provisions, including methods and materials; and*
- (viii) alternative methods of shoreline protection, including “no project”.*

- (4) the impact on beach scouring and sand replenishment shall be minimized;*

- (5) water runoff from beneath existing seawalls shall be minimized;*

- (6) existing unauthorized rubble or protective devices shall be removed prior to the approval of additional development in such areas; and*

- (7) a geotechnical engineer shall certify that the shoreline protection device will withstand storms comparable to the major winter storms of 1982 and 1983 along the California coast.*

...

Discussion

In reviewing requests for shoreline protection projects, the Commission must assess both the need to protect existing development and the potential adverse impacts to public resources. A number of adverse impacts to public resources are associated with the construction of shoreline protective devices. These include the loss of public beach displaced by the structure, “permanently” fixing the back of the beach that halts the landward migration of the bluff and beach, the narrowing and potential elimination of beach in front of the structure, a reduction or elimination of sand contribution to the beach from adjacent bluffs, sand loss from the beach due to wave reflection and scour, accelerated erosion on adjacent unprotected properties, and visual impacts associated with the construction of a shoreline protection device on the natural bluffs.

The applicants have made a showing that existing, bluff-top structures are in danger from erosion, and that shoreline protection in some form is necessary to protect these structures. In the interim since the

A-2-PAC-00-010, 2-00-009 (City of Pacifica)

May 2001 hearing, the City's engineering consultant, Cotton, Shires and Associates (CSA), has provided a detailed slope stability analysis of the bluff in relation to structures on the bluff top. This analysis has been reviewed by the Commission's staff geologist, who concurs that it adequately describes the stability of the site. The western edge of Esplanade Drive ranges from 40 to 80 feet from the bluff top. Contained within the Esplanade Drive right-of-way is important infrastructure including a trunk sewer line, water main, natural gas line power and telephone lines. Esplanade Drive provides access to 11 homes along the eastern side of the street and coastal bluff top access along its length. The revetment protects all of these structures. In addition, the two remaining homes west of the street at 528 and 532 Esplanade Drive are protected by the revetment.

The slope stability analysis provided by the City's consultant, CSA, models the static stability of the bluff without regard to bluff retreat processes such as wave erosion and evaluates the likelihood of failure of the bluff along failure planes at angles from the foot of the bluff, assuming the revetment had not been constructed. The study is based on geologic conditions and assumptions concerning soil cohesion and peak friction angle in the strata of poorly consolidated alluvial deposits and underlying Greenstone bedrock composing the bluff. Generally, a factor of safety (FS) of 1.5 is considered adequate to protect new development from geologic instability.⁴ The study prepared shows that Esplanade Avenue lies east of and behind the 1.5 FOS failure plane for the length of the revetment (**Exhibit 10**). The study also shows that only the existing house at 532 Esplanade Drive is intersected by the 1.5 FS failure plane (**Exhibit 10**). As the factor of safety decreases below 1.5, structures are at increased risk from geologic instability, and when the factor of safety approaches 1.0, the degree of threat becomes imminent. Parts of the coastal bluff at the site have a calculated factor of safety of only 1.0 or slightly greater (without the revetment in place), indicating that failure of the bluff would be imminent. Without the revetment in place, these areas would be at heightened risk of damage from slope failure. The study emphasizes that the slope stability analysis is based on static stability, and does not address additional instability that might be expected during an earthquake. Further, if the present profile of the bluff were to be allowed to be undercut by wave attack, slope stability would decrease and the 1.5 FS contour line will advance eastward, undercutting Esplanade Avenue. Nevertheless, at the present time no structures are imminently threatened by slope instability.

The retreat of the bluff in response to wave attack provides additional information concerning the length of time that might pass before structures are threatened by slope instability. The City has provided additional information concerning long-term erosion rate and episodic retreat rate. Long term bluff retreat rates have been estimated at approximately two feet per year based on an analysis of 11 aerial photographs taken between 1946 and 1999. Skelly Engineering, an engineering consultant for the City, calculates the average retreat rate between 1997 and 1999 at 15.5 feet per year. This is not a long-term bluff retreat rate, but rather an indication of the amount of retreat that can be expected at this site during an extreme erosion event. As noted by the City's consultant, CSA long-term average annual retreat rate does not adequately describe bluff retreat or evaluate danger to bluff-top structures from erosion. The Commission's staff geologist concurs with this assessment. During the 1997-98 winter storms, retreat ranging from 25 to up to 50 feet occurred along the bluff, with average retreat in excess of 35 feet, and a discrete episode of 30 feet in one location during a two-week period in February 1998. The City's consultant notes that episodic retreat is linked to frequency of especially heavy storm years and in particular El Niño conditions, which occur based on review of NOAA-designated El Niño events over the last 50 years on average every 7 years. The frequency of heavy storm seasons gives some

⁴ FOS is a ratio based on weight of bluff above the failure plane and the frictional and static forces opposing this weight. An FOS of 1.0 indicates these forces are equal.

insight into the probability of bluff failure, since retreat results from undermining of the exposed, friable bluff base by storm waves. However, it is not possible to predict episodic retreat accurately. For purposes of assessing risk to bluff top structures, both the Commission staff geologist and engineer concur that given historic episodic bluff retreat in this area, existing bluff-top structures including even those portions of Esplanade Drive presently farthest from the bluff edge could be damaged in one to two years, if an erosion event comparable to the 1997-1998 El Nino were to recur. Therefore, based on the existence of structures on the blufftop seaward of the 1.5 FOS failure plane and the history of episodic bluff retreat at the site, the Commission finds that existing structures located on the bluff would be at risk from damage due to erosion if there were no shoreline protection.

Alternatives Analysis

The policies of the certified LCP and the Coastal Act further require the design of any shoreline protective device to be the least environmentally damaging alternative, and to be the most protective of shoreline processes. After the City's action had been appealed to the Commission, the City provided the Commission with an alternatives analysis for construction of the revetment. Since the May 2001 hearing, the City has provided additional analysis of project alternatives, including managed retreat, construction of a vertical seawall, sand replenishment, and a revetment of reduced length protecting only the two remaining homes west of Esplanade Drive.

Managed Retreat

The managed retreat alternative would include the removal and relocation of homes, Esplanade Drive, and utilities within the Esplanade Drive right-of-way, as well as removal of the revetment itself. Access to 11 homes on the east side of Esplanade Drive would also be lost, impacting those properties. With no shoreline protection in place, wave forces would gradually erode the bluff top and could, based on observed episodic retreat rates, undermine both the two remaining and those portions of Esplanade Drive closest to the bluff edge within a matter of as little as one to two storm seasons. The relocation of the bluff-top infrastructure would incur significant costs and take several months to accomplish. The City has provided a revised cost estimate of removing the existing revetment of more than \$4 million, not counting the value of the property and improvements which would eventually be lost. The City concluded that the excessive cost of this alternative renders the managed retreat alternative infeasible. Given the significant costs of revetment removal coupled with the impacts to existing structures and associated costs, the managed retreat alternative is not a feasible alternative to the proposed project.

Seawall Alternative

A steel-reinforced concrete, vertical seawall would be an alternative, effective means of stabilizing the entire bluff. The City discusses a seawall at the project site to reach 40-45 feet MSL (about 20 feet taller than the existing revetment) to retain the unstable bluff behind it. A vertical seawall would have a reduced footprint compared to the existing revetment and would reduce impacts to beach and public access accordingly. However, the cost of such a seawall is estimated to be at least \$2 million and as much as \$4 million. Assuming costs of removal of the existing revetment of about \$4 million, the total construction cost including revetment removal would range from \$6 million to \$8 million. No funding is available for the City to remove the revetment and construct a seawall. The City concluded that the excessive cost of this alternative renders the vertical seawall alternative infeasible. Furthermore, the construction of the wall would require significantly more modification of the existing landform due to the size of the footing excavation and the necessary drilling of stabilization into the bluff. Additional resource impacts would likely occur during the removal of the revetment. Also, the vertical seawall

A-2-PAC-00-010, 2-00-009 (City of Pacifica)

reflects almost all of the incoming wave energy. The reflected energy may interact with incoming wave energy and may exacerbate erosion on unprotected adjacent portions of shoreline. In comparison, the proposed revetment dissipates about 40-50% of the incoming wave energy and causes fewer impacts to adjacent bluffs and beach. A vertical seawall is accordingly not a feasible, less environmentally damaging alternative to the proposed project because of excessive cost constraints and the impacts to the bluffs and other coastal resources.

Sand Replenishment Alternative

The City's consultant, Skelly Engineering, concludes that the viability of sand replenishment as an alternative to the existing revetment could only be clearly determined after extensive oceanographic and geologic studies of the area, at very significant expense, and that such an alternative would be prohibitively costly and ultimately ineffective in slowing the rate of bluff retreat. Sand replenishment is generally not suited to shorter lengths of shoreline of a few hundred feet and would require ongoing replenishment program and continuing costs. Any sand replenishment program also would result in additional environmental impacts from hundreds of truck trips required to deliver sand. As a result, based on available information, sand replenishment is not a feasible less environmentally damaging alternative to the proposed revetment.

Reduced Footprint Alternative

At the May 2001 hearing, the Commission directed staff to consider a reduced footprint alternative which would remove all revetment except that directly protecting the two, remaining homes west of Esplanade Drive. At present, the southern end of revetment is keyed into relatively erosion-resistant bedrock. Reduction of the length of the revetment would leave the exposed southern end of the revetment vulnerable to outflanking, and would likely resulting in severe incursion of erosion south of the reduced revetment. This alternative would not protect Esplanade Drive and associated infrastructure or preserve access to the bluff top and homes east of Esplanade Drive. The reduced footprint alternative would result in essentially the same disadvantages as the managed retreat alternative along the area of unprotected bluff. For these reasons, the reduced footprint alternative is not a feasible alternative to the proposed project.

The Commission finds that the history of the project site and the Pacifica shoreline in general provide evidence that the existing bluff-top development in the project area is in danger from erosion, and that some form of shoreline protection is necessary. Given the costs and impacts posed by the construction of a vertical seawall and the infeasibility of the managed retreat alternative, the Commission finds that the proposed revetment is the only feasible alternative to protect existing structures from dangers associated with bluff retreat. Therefore, the Commission finds that the revetment is required to protect existing structures, including Esplanade Drive itself, the infrastructure within the public right-of-way, and the existing houses at 528 and 532 Esplanade Drive.

Effect on Sand Supply

Although the need for the proposed revetment has been documented, the policies of the LCP and Coastal Act further require the determination of whether the proposed project alters natural shoreline processes. If significant adverse impacts are identified, the project must mitigate or eliminate adverse effects on local shoreline sand supply. Any revetment that attempts to stabilize bluffs and halt natural bluff retreat may significantly alter natural shoreline processes, since the bluffs are a source of material that makes up the beach substrate. The inability for the bluff to nourish the sand supply with the installation of a revetment can lead to progressive loss of sand on the beach.

A-2-PAC-00-010, 2-00-009 (City of Pacifica)

The proposed revetment prevents storm waves from hitting the bluff toe, thereby preventing landward retreat of the entire bluff. However, the proposed revetment does not prevent the gradual erosion of the upper portion of the bluff by wind and rain. Thus, the upper bluff continues to supply material to the beach. Since the proposed revetment covers approximately 20 feet of the 60 to 70- foot tall bluffs, the surrounding beaches will experience only a minor loss to the local sand supply. Furthermore, in quantifying total sand supply in the project area, the City's consulting engineer indicates that the bluff consists mainly of greenstone bedrock, relic dune sands, and alluvium. The bedrock weathers to clay and silt and does not contribute sand to the beach. The relic dune sand contains about 90% sand but is only about 10 feet thick. Alluvium in the bluff is about 30 feet thick and weathers to gravel and 35% sand. Based on an estimated bluff retreat rate of two feet per year, the shoreline behind the revetment contributes about 335 cubic yards of sand to the beach per year. The City has also indicated that the primary sources of local sand for the beach are San Pedro Creek, Laguna Salada, Milagra Creek and Big Inch Creek, as well as bluff erosion. In comparison to the potential longshore sand transport of about 100,000 cubic yards annually (Battalio 1996), the sand lost from the local sand supply is insignificant. Therefore, as proposed, the project avoids significant adverse impacts to sand supply.

As discussed above, however, the existing drainage of the bluff-top area and Esplanade Drive through storm drains emptying through a culvert onto the beach below the revetment could result in at least seasonal erosion of beach sand below the storm drain outfall. To address such impacts, the Commission imposes **Special Condition 5**, which requires that the City submit a Revised Drainage Plan for review and approval of the Executive Director prior to permit issuance and further requires the City to redirect the existing bluff-top runoff away from the beach in accordance with the approved plan.

LCP Zoning Code Ordinance 9-4.4406 lists specific information that the City needs to consider in the design and siting of the revetment, including provisions for maintenance and the methods and materials used. **Special Condition 1** requires the City to inspect the revetment after all major storm events and at least twice a year to look for specific signs of potential revetment failure or impacts to coastal resources. If the City finds signs of potential failure, a monitoring report must be prepared that includes recommendations for repair or maintenance of the project. **Special Condition 1** also requires the City to submit a monitoring report every year for the life of the structure to evaluate the condition and performance of the revetment, analyze erosion trends of the bluff, and recommend repair, maintenance, modifications, or other work to the revetment. If the recommended measures constitute development under the Coastal Act, a CDP or permit amendment is required.

Special Condition 1 further requires the City to remove, redeposit, or reposition rock that becomes dislodged from the revetment, remove debris and trash from the revetment, and clean the 6-inch perforated pipe under the fill buttress. Best Management Practices must be used to maintain the fill buttress. In addition, the City must maintain the access road in a stable and non-eroded condition to allow maintenance activities to occur. At present, the lower portion of the access road has eroded. These monitoring and maintenance measures are necessary to ensure that the proposed project minimizes the risk to life and property.

The Commission finds that, as conditioned, the proposed project is consistent with LCP Land Use Plan Policy 16 / Coastal Act Section 30235 requiring shoreline protection structures to mitigate or eliminate adverse impacts to local shoreline sand supply.

Conclusion

Bluff retreat of the project area threatened a public road, public utilities, public property, and private residences. An analysis of alternatives to the proposed revetment demonstrates that the revetment is the

least environmentally damaging feasible alternative method to protect these structures and is therefore required to protect the existing structures. As conditioned, the proposed project will not significantly alter natural shoreline processes or impact the local shoreline sand supply. Pursuant to **Special Condition 1**, the City is required to maintain the revetment in fulfillment of Zoning Code LCP Zoning Code Ordinance 9-4.4406. Pursuant to **Special Condition 5**, the City must redirect bluff-top drainage away from the beach in accordance with an approved Revised Drainage Plan. Therefore, the Commission finds that as conditioned the proposed project is consistent with LCP Land Use Plan Policy 16 / Coastal Act Section 30235 and LCP Zoning Code Ordinance 9-4.4406.

2.6 Hazards

Issue Summary

To minimize the risk of hazards associated with the project, **Special Condition 1** requires the City to inspect and maintain the revetment regularly. Maintenance of the revetment includes the removal or redeposit of dislodged rock as soon as possible after displacement occurs and the removal of debris and trash from the revetment. The City must also maintain the fill buttress and maintenance access road. **Special Condition 1** further requires the submission of a monitoring report at least once a year that evaluates the condition and performance of the revetment and makes recommendations for the structure's repair and maintenance. As conditioned, the Commission finds that the proposed project conforms with the LCP and Coastal Act policies for the minimization of risks and assurance of geologic stability in areas of high geologic hazard.

Although intended to protect private property and public infrastructure from hazards associated with bluff erosion, the proposed revetment and associated development may create hazards to the public. For example, if not properly maintained, rock from the revetment could tumble into the surf zone where it would be hazardous to beach users or surfers. Sloughing or erosion of the maintenance access road or the fill buttress could also pose a safety risk to people at the base of the bluff or on the bluff top. Despite its hazardous nature, the City has voluntarily chosen to carry out the proposed project. The Commission therefore imposes **Special Condition 2** requiring the City to assume the risks of development, waive any claim of liability against the Commission for such losses, and indemnify and hold the Commission harmless against third party claims against the Commission as a result of any hazards associated with the proposed project.

LCP and Coastal Act Policies

LCP Land Use Plan Policy 26 / Coastal Act Section 30253 in relevant part states:

New development shall:

- (1) Minimize risks to life and property in areas of high geologic, flood, and fire hazard.*
- (2) Assure stability and structural integrity, and neither create nor contribute significantly to erosion, geologic instability, or destruction of the site or surrounding area or in any way require the construction of protective devices that would substantially alter natural landforms along bluffs and cliffs.*

Discussion

To minimize hazards caused by the proposed project, the City proposes to monitor and maintain the revetment and associated development. To reduce the potential for hazards, the Commission imposes **Special Condition 1** to require the City to inspect the revetment after all major storm events and at least twice a year to look for specific signs of potential revetment failure or impacts to coastal

A-2-PAC-00-010, 2-00-009 (City of Pacifica)

resources. If the City finds signs of potential failure, a monitoring report must be prepared that includes recommendations for repair or maintenance of the project. If the recommended measures constitute development under the Coastal Act, a CDP amendment is required. **Special Condition 1** requires the City to submit a monitoring report every year for the life of the structure to evaluate the condition and performance of the revetment, to analyze erosion trends of the bluff, and to recommend repair, maintenance, modifications, or other work to the revetment.

Special Condition 1 further requires the City to remove, redeposit, or reposition rock that becomes dislodged from the revetment, remove debris and trash from the revetment, and clean the 6-inch perforated pipe under the fill buttress. Best Management Practices must be used to maintain the fill buttress. In addition, the City must maintain the access road in a non-erosive condition to allow maintenance activities to occur. These monitoring and maintenance measures are necessary to ensure that the proposed project minimizes the risk to life and property.

Despite the monitoring and maintenance requirements imposed by **Special Condition 1**, the revetment, fill buttress, and associated development may still constitute potentially hazardous development. The proposed project could pose safety risks for members of the public using the beach or the top of the bluff. For instance, rock from the revetment could dislodge and move onto the beach or into the surf zone and become hazardous to beach users or surfers. The applicant has voluntarily chosen to implement the project despite the risk of hazards. The Commission therefore imposes **Special Condition 2** to require the City to assume the risks of any loss or damage associated with or arising out of the proposed development, waive any claim of liability against the Commission for such damage or loss, and indemnify the Commission against third party claims brought against the Commission in connection with or arising out of the approved development.

Conclusion

The proposed development may pose hazards to people on the bluff top or on the beach. To assure that the project minimizes such risks, **Special Condition 1** requires the City to frequently monitor and maintain the proposed revetment, fill buttress, and access road.

Because the applicants propose potentially hazardous development, **Special Condition 2** requires the City to assume the risk of any loss or damage associated with or arising out of the proposed development. The Commission finds that as conditioned, the project minimizes risks to life and property in areas of high geologic hazard, consistent with LCP Policy 26/Coastal Act Policy 30253.

2.7 Public Access and Public Recreation

Issue Summary

As proposed, the revetment and fill buttress will occupy 32,000 square feet of public sandy beach. The proposed project impedes lateral access along the coast under certain beach profiles and tide conditions. To minimize the proposed project's impacts to lateral public access and public recreation on the beach, **Special Condition 1** requires the City to maintain the revetment, fill buttress, and access road to minimize intrusions of dislodged rock or fill on the public beach. To mitigate for the loss of public beach, **Special Condition 3** requires the City to provide public access improvements on 24,000 square feet of property currently owned by the City within one year of issuance of the CDP. To fully offset the 32,000 square feet of lost public beach, **Special Condition 3** also requires the City to provide additional public access improvements on 8,000 sq. ft. of additional property if the City acquires more

A-2-PAC-00-010, 2-00-009 (City of Pacifica)

bluff-top property in the future.. As conditioned, the proposed project is consistent with the LCP and Coastal Act policies protecting public access along the coast and public recreation.

LCP and Coastal Act Policies

Coastal Act Section 30210 states:

In carrying out the requirement of Section 4 of Article X of the California Constitution, maximum access, which shall be conspicuously posted, and recreational opportunities shall be provided for all the people consistent with public safety needs and the need to protect public rights, rights of private property owners, and natural resource areas from overuse.

LCP Land Use Plan Policy 1 states:

Maximum access shall be conspicuously posted and recreational opportunities shall be provided for all the people consistent with public safety needs and the need to protect public rights, rights of property owners, and natural resource areas from overuse.

LCP Land Use Plan Policy 2 / Coastal Act Section 30211 states:

Development shall not interfere with the public's right of access to the sea where acquired through use or legislative authorization, including, but not limited to, the use of dry sand and rocky coastal beaches to the first line of terrestrial vegetation.

LCP Land Use Plan Policy 3 / Coastal Act Policy 30212 states in applicable part:

(a) Public access from the nearest public roadway to the shoreline and along the coast shall be provided in new development projects except where

(1) it is inconsistent with public safety, military security needs, or the protection of fragile coastal resources,

(2) adequate access exists nearby, or,

...

LCP Zoning Code Ordinance 9-4.4404 (Geotechnical Suitability) states in relevant part:

(b) Required Survey. A geotechnical survey, consistent with the City's Administrative Policy #34 and prepared by a registered geologist or geotechnical engineer, shall be submitted to the Director pursuant to Section 9-4.4304, Coastal Development Permit Procedures and Findings, for all new development located in the following settings:

(1) Areas showing evidence of landslides or landslide potential;

(2) Areas showing evidence of ground shaking or earth movement;

(3) Within fifty (50) feet of a coastal bluff;

(4) On all slopes greater than fifteen (15) percent; or

(5) Within sand dune habitats.

...

(d) Development Standards. The following standards shall apply to new development in areas identified in Section 9-4.4404(b).

A-2-PAC-00-010, 2-00-009 (City of Pacifica)

...

- (3) *The density of new development shall be based on the net development developable area, as established in the required geotechnical survey;*

...

- (5) *Consistent with the City's Seismic Safety and Safety Element, new development shall be set back from the coastal bluffs an adequate distance to accommodate a 100-year event, whether caused by seismic, geotechnical, or storm conditions, unless such a setback renders the site undevelopable. In such case, the setback may be reduced to the minimum extent necessary to permit economically viable development of the site, provided a qualified geologist determines that there would be no threat to public safety and health.*

...

LCP Zoning Code Ordinance 9-4.4406 (Shoreline Protection) states in relevant part:

- (c) *Development standards. The following standards shall apply to all new development along the shoreline and on coastal bluffs.*

...

- (8) *The seawall shall be designed to minimize impacts upon existing lateral and vertical access and in any case shall not result in the blocking of an accessway. In cases where it is not possible to engineer a wall without blocking access, then appropriate mitigation measures shall be incorporated into the design. These measures can include a stairway over the seawall to provide continuous vertical access or a platform over the seawall to provide continuous lateral access.*

LCP Zoning Code Ordinance 9-4.4407 (Public Shoreline Access) states in relevant part:

- (b) *Development standards. The following standards shall apply to all new access provisions.*

- (1) *to provide separation between shoreline access and residential uses and to protect the privacy and security of residents and homes, any required access easements shall comply with the following setbacks, where feasible:*

- (i) *the inland edge of lateral shoreline trails shall be at least twenty-five (25) feet from any occupied or proposed residence. However, in the event a 25' access buffer will not provide adequate lateral public access in compliance with the access provisions of the Coastal Act or with the Access Component of the LCP Land Use Plan, a narrower access buffer may be required. In no event shall the lateral accessway extend any closer than 10' from the residence in question; and*

...

- (3) *public shoreline access improvements such as trails, ramps, railings, viewing areas, restrooms, and parking facilities shall be sited and designed to be accessible to people of limited mobility to the maximum extent feasible;*
- (4) *public shoreline access improvements such as trails, ramps, railings, viewing areas, restrooms, and parking facilities shall be sited and designed to be compatible with the natural character of the shoreline;*
- (5) *public shoreline access signage shall identify access location, destination areas,*

A-2-PAC-00-010, 2-00-009 (City of Pacifica)

environmentally sensitive habitat, and hazardous conditions, and be compatible with the natural appearance and character of the shoreline by using appropriate color, size, form, and material; and

...

- (7) *with respect to lateral bluff top access, the easement shall be adjusted inland from the current bluff edge if it recedes inland, but in no event shall the trail be closer than ten (10') feet to an occupied or proposed residence. Such an inland adjustment shall not occur in the event it would prohibit private use of a site or would render use or development of the site economically infeasible.*

Discussion

The coast in the proposed project area is popular and draws greater-than-local users. Formalized public vertical access to the City-owned beach is available at two points in the vicinity of the project area. A wooden stairway extends from Esplanade Drive to the beach and is located about 0.4 miles north of the proposed project area. Another accessway is located approximately 0.25 miles south of the project area on Palmetto Avenue. A paved 20-space public parking lot at this location leads to a dirt path that ends on the top of the proposed riprap and the culverted Milagra Creek.

On the bluff top of the project site, a 5-foot tall chain-link fence is located about 40 feet from the bluff edge. Slats in the lower two feet of fence serve to prevent sand from blowing onto the street. A concrete k-rail barrier fronts the one-way Esplanade Drive about 60 feet from the edge of the bluff. Aside from the placement of base rock within the Esplanade Drive right-of-way and fill placed south of the intersection of Esplanade and Avalon Drives west of the k-rail barrier, there are no other improvements to the bluff top in the location of the former residences.

At low tides, the public can traverse the beach from the northern boundary of the City almost to the Pacifica pier. The proposed project area falls between these two points and constitutes an important link for lateral access along the coast. At high tides, much of the beach at the proposed project site is covered in water, with water sometimes reaching the revetment. Although a portion of coastal bluff juts out south of the project area and may limit lateral passage by the public during high tide, lateral public access along the beach is available under most conditions.

As constructed, the revetment extends approximately 40 feet seaward of the base of the bluff. With a length of about 700 feet, the revetment occupies about 28,000 square feet of public beach, directly reducing the amount of beach available for public access and recreational use. The fill buttress in the southern part of the project site covers an additional approximately 4,000 square feet of public beach. Thus, the proposed development would result in the direct loss of approximately 32,000 square feet of public beach. The area lost may have provided the only lateral access available in front of the revetment during high tides and winter beach conditions. In addition, the revetment would affect the beach profile and decrease the area available for public use by reducing the beach seaward of the ordinary high water mark. Rocks falling or migrating further on the beach and into the surf zone may exacerbate those impacts. Because the proposed revetment would result in significant adverse impacts to the public's ability to laterally access the beach, the proposed project does not conform with the LCP and Coastal Act policies for public access and public recreation.

LCP Zoning Code Ordinance 9-4406(c)(8) entitled "Shoreline Protection" requires seawalls to minimize impacts on existing access and avoid blocking accessways. The zoning code provision uses the term *seawall* in its requirement for shoreline development to provide the incorporation of

A-2-PAC-00-010, 2-00-009 (City of Pacifica)

appropriate mitigation measures into the seawall design when it is not possible to engineer a wall to avoid blocking access. Because the City uses *seawall* interchangeably to describe other shoreline protection devices, including revetments, in documents such as the General Plan and the City's May 26, 1998 City Council Summary Report giving City staff direction on the construction of the revetment, the ordinance applies to the proposed project.

To minimize impacts to public access on the beach, **Special Condition 1** requires the City to maintain the development to keep material from the revetment or fill buttress from falling onto the beach, thereby minimizing the proposed development's impact on lateral public access and public recreation. Under **Special Condition 1**, the City must remove any rock that migrates from the revetment further onto the beach or into the surf zone.

Special Condition 3 requires the City to provide for bluff-top public access improvements and mitigate the loss of sandy beach due to the construction of the proposed revetment and fill buttress. The requirements of **Special Condition 3** are consistent with the LCP and City's plans to establish lateral access on the bluff top. The City's Land Use Plan acknowledges the potential removal of bluff-top residences due to bluff retreat on the 500-block of Esplanade Drive and contemplates, if conditions permit, the provision of public access and viewpoints on the top of the bluff in the event the homes are removed. As noted in the City's March 20, 2000 staff report, the bluff-top lots "will not be redeveloped, except possibly for public open space and/or passive recreational improvements (benches, etc...)". Furthermore, the City has communicated with Commission staff in correspondence dated October 13, 2000 that "City acquisition of the 8 vacant bluff top properties, for purposes of preservation and possibly passive use in the future, will add to the public's ability to access and enjoy unobstructed panoramic views of the shoreline and Pacific Ocean." Since the City is currently planning a bike trail at the top of the bluff, and the proposed revetment will result in significant adverse impacts to the public's ability to laterally access the beach, the Commission finds that the project presents an opportunity to provide public access where such a need is already recognized.

The provision of bluff-top lateral access is also consistent with the March 2000 Pacifica Bicycle Plan, approved by the City Council in 2000. The bike plan states that south of the intersection of Esplanade and Manor Drives (that is, at the project site), the bikeway shifts off-street onto an unpaved trail surface and continues to the south end of Esplanade Drive. The previous bikeway on Esplanade Drive was a Class III bike route that was unstriped and part of the road shared with motor vehicle traffic. The plan identifies the need to close the gap in the existing north/south bicycle route in the area south of Manor Drive with a Class I, 8-foot wide bikeway with 5,600 square feet of paved path. The California Department of Transportation *Highway Design Manual* defines a Class I bikeway as a path that "provides a completely separated right-of-way for the exclusive use of bicycles and pedestrians with crossflow minimized." The Class I bikeway contemplated is the top priority in the plan's list of Bicycle Facilities Improvements and Priorities. The plan proposes that the existing dirt trail on the west side of Esplanade Drive would be paved to connect with additional Class I bikeway contemplated through the recreational vehicle park south of the project area to the parking lot and vertical accessway on Palmetto Drive. The plan also calls for signage improvements in this area.

Accordingly, to mitigate the loss of about 32,000 square feet of public beach and the significant adverse impacts of the proposed revetment on the public's ability to laterally access the beach, **Special Condition 3** requires the City to provide public access improvements on the approximately 24,000 square feet of City-owned property on the bluff top. In addition, **Special Condition 3** requires that if the City acquires additional property at APNs 009-161-010, 009-161-020, 009-161-

A-2-PAC-00-010, 2-00-009 (City of Pacifica)

100, and 009-161-110 adjacent to the property currently owned by the City, the City shall also provide up to 8,000 square feet of additional public access and public passive recreation improvements on the acquired property. By providing for the provision of at least 24,000 and up to 32,000 square feet of improved public access, **Special Condition 3** is adequate to offset the loss of 32,000 square feet of public beach covered by the proposed development. The required public access improvements shall include a trail for pedestrians, persons of limited mobility, and bicycles separated from Esplanade Drive signage, overlook point(s), benches, native landscaping and the removal of the concrete k-rail barrier, chain link fence on the 500-block of Esplanade Drive and fence separating APN 009-161-140 from the adjacent City-owned property. The inland edge of the trail must be at least 10 feet from all occupied residences. The required signage must identify the location of vertical and lateral public accessways, bicycle routes, destination areas, environmentally sensitive habitat, and hazardous conditions. The public access improvements shall be sited and designed for compatibility with the natural appearance and character of the shoreline. **Special Condition 3** also requires the City to submit to the Executive Director for review and approval the public access plan depicting the required public access improvements within 90 days of the Commission's action on this permit application and a schedule for the construction of the required improvements within one year of issuance of the CDPs. The public access improvements depicted on the final approved plans shall be constructed within one year of the issuance of this coastal development permit.

The provision of public access improvements on the bluff top further requires the removal of the chain-link fence along the 500-block of Esplanade Drive. The 5-foot tall, 550-foot long chain-link fence currently impedes access to the top of the bluff. To protect public safety, **Special Condition 3** requires the installation of a new fence as close to the bluff edge as feasible. The new fence shall be of an open design, compatible with the natural character of the site, and shall not obstruct views.

Special Condition 3 requires the removal of the wooden fence that separates all or portions of APN 009-161-140 from the adjacent City-owned property. This parcel is the southernmost bluff-top property in the project area. Although the City now owns the property, it is fenced in with the recreational vehicle park south of the project area. The removal of the fence facilitates use of the City-owned property by the public. Any new fence proposed to separate the recreational vehicle park from the City-owned property shall require a coastal development permit.

The City currently owns about 24,000 square feet of the bluff-top property formerly occupied by single-family residences. **Exhibit 8** shows the locations of City-owned and private property in the project area. To allow for public access improvements on the bluff top consistent with public safety needs, **Special Condition 3** requires a licensed geologist or geotechnical engineer to determine the net developable area of the bluff-top property. The City defines *net developable area* in the Land Use Plan as "the portion of a site determined by a geologist to remain useable throughout the design life of the project and determined to be adequate to withstand a 100-year hazard event". **Special Condition 3** also requires a licensed geologist or geotechnical engineer to determine the development setback from the edge of the bluff sufficient to protect the public access improvements for the design life of the improvements.

The remaining property on the top of the bluff in private ownership totals approximately 13,500 square feet comprised of 4,500 square feet of vacant property and about 9,000 square feet of property on which two residences are located. **Special Condition 3** requires the City to provide public access improvements on up to 8,000 square feet of the bluff-top properties currently in private ownership in the event that the City acquires the properties in the future. As required by **Special Condition 3**, a licensed geologist or geotechnical engineer must determine the net developable area and development

A-2-PAC-00-010, 2-00-009 (City of Pacifica)

setback of any bluff-top property acquired, and the City must submit a public access improvement plan for these properties. As conditioned, the 24,000 square feet of City-owned property and the 8,000 square feet contemplated for future acquisition total 32,000 square feet, the same area of public beach covered by the revetment.

The provision of public access and passive recreation improvements required by **Special Condition 3** mitigates the loss of public recreation uses on the beach caused by the occupation of public beach by the proposed development. Although the mitigation would ideally require the City to provide public access equal in place and manner to that lost (that is, public access on the beach), the Commission finds that the requirements of **Special Condition 3** to provide public shoreline access improvements on the top of the bluff is related to the impacts of the proposed revetment on the public's ability to use the beach. Because many bluff-top areas in Pacifica are in private ownership and inaccessible to the public, the provision of public access improvements at the project site allows for one of the few opportunities to walk along the open bluff top in the City. Therefore, the requirements of **Special Condition 3** appropriately mitigate the loss of sandy beach caused by the construction of the proposed revetment and fill buttress.

Conclusion

The proposed project will occupy 32,000 square feet of public beach and interfere with lateral public access along the shoreline. **Special Condition 1** requires the City to minimize the impact to lateral access by maintaining the revetment to remove dislodged rock from the surf zone. The provision of public access improvements on the bluff-top property as required by **Special Condition 3** is adequate to offset the encroachment of the revetment on public beach. Therefore, the Commission finds that as conditioned, the proposed development is consistent with the public access and public recreation policies of the City's LCP and the Coastal Act.

2.8 Environmentally Sensitive Habitats and Marine Biological Resources

Issue Summary

Because the city constructed the revetment under emergency conditions, there was not sufficient time to conduct a thorough assessment of potential impacts to sensitive marine and terrestrial habitats. However, in 1998, the City did consult with State and federal agencies, including the California Department of Fish and Game and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service prior to constructing the revetment. None of these agencies expressed concerns regarding potential significant impacts to sensitive habitats at that time. After the project was appealed to the Commission, and consistent with the Zoning Code requirement to obtain a biological survey, the City conducted a more complete reconnaissance of biological resources in the area. This study found no evidence of sensitive habitat in the project area. Therefore, based on the biological survey required by the certified LCP, the Commission finds that the proposed development will not impact environmentally sensitive habitat areas or marine biological resources and is consistent with the LCP and Coastal Act policies in place to protect them.

LCP and Coastal Act Policies

LCP Land Use Plan Policy 18 states:

Environmentally sensitive habitat areas shall be protected against any significant disruption of habitat values, and only uses dependent on those resources shall be allowed within those areas. Development in areas adjacent to environmentally sensitive habitat areas and parks and

A-2-PAC-00-010, 2-00-009 (City of Pacifica)

recreation areas shall be sited and designed to prevent impacts which would significantly degrade those areas, and shall be compatible with the continuance of such habitat areas.

Zoning Code Ordinance 9-4.4403 (Habitat Preservation) states in relevant part:

- (b) Required Survey. A habitat survey, prepared by a qualified biologist or botanist, may be required to determine the exact location of environmentally sensitive habitat areas and to recommend mitigation measures that minimize potential impacts to the habitat. This survey shall be submitted to and approved by the Director pursuant to Section 9-4.4304, Coastal Development Permit Procedures and Findings, for all new development that meets one (1) or more of the following criteria:*
- (1) The project is located within an environmentally sensitive habitat area as documented in the LCP Land Use Plan, or through the Director's on-site investigation and review of resource information; or*
 - (2) The project site is or may be located within one hundred (100) feet of an environmentally sensitive habitat area and/or has the potential to negatively impact the long-term maintenance of the habitat.*

...

Coastal Act Section 30240 states:

- (a) Environmentally sensitive habitat areas shall be protected against any significant disruption of habitat values, and only uses dependent on those resources shall be allowed within those areas.*
- (b) Development in areas adjacent to environmentally sensitive habitat areas and parks and recreation areas shall be sited and designed to prevent impacts which would significantly degrade those areas, and shall be compatible with the continuance of those habitat and recreation areas.*

Discussion

In correspondence with Commission staff on April 19, 2000 and October 16, 2000, the City states that it consulted with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Game (DFG), U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. National Marine Fisheries Service, and the Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary before the construction of the project in 1998. The City states that the agencies' representatives did not express concerns with the proposed revetment. In subsequent communication with the City dated January 17, 2001, the USFWS reaffirms that the project does not adversely affect federally-listed species.

On October 13, 2000, consistent with the requirement in Zoning Code Ordinance 9-4.4403 to obtain a biological assessment from a qualified biologist, the City submitted to the Commission a June 30, 2000 biological assessment of the project site by Ecosystems West, the City's biological consultant. A literature search of special-status plant and wildlife species known to occur or with the potential to occur in the project area revealed that the site does not contain suitable habitat for any special, rare, threatened, or endangered species. The assessment included a site reconnaissance by the consultant, conducted by visually examining the bluff face and beach area. The consultant did not observe any special-status plants or wildlife in the project area during the reconnaissance. The assessment states that the bluff in the area of the project contains a seeping sandstone layer, and that the bluff face exhibits rills and slides from erosion. Because the bluff consists of extremely soft sandstone, and because the bluff lacks ledges or crevices, the consultant concludes that it is unlikely that the bluff ever

supported habitat for cliff nesting species. Furthermore, the assessment states that the federally threatened western snowy plover requires light-colored sand beaches with semi-protected dunes for nesting, and that it is unlikely plovers nest in the project vicinity because the beach is a dark color and contains no dune habitat.

Based on the information obtained through a biological assessment prepared by a qualified biologist, the proposed project does not adversely impact environmentally sensitive habitat areas. Since the proposed project site does not contain environmentally sensitive habitat areas and is not adjacent to any such areas, the project is consistent with Land Use Plan Policy 18, Coastal Act Section 30240, and Zoning Code Ordinance 9-4.403 which prohibit the disruption of habitat values.

Conclusion

The biological assessment of the project site found no evidence that the project site contains habitat for special status plants or wildlife. The biological assessment furthermore did not record any occurrences of environmentally sensitive species on the project site or on adjacent property. Therefore, as proposed, the project will not adversely impact environmentally sensitive areas, consistent with LCP Policy 18/Coastal Act Policy 30240.

2.9 Visual Resources

Issue Summary

The proposed project alters the natural landform and does not blend into the natural setting of the surrounding bluffs and beach. To minimize the visual impact of the proposed development, **Special Condition 1** requires the applicant to frequently and thoroughly monitor and maintain the revetment to identify potential problems, remove displaced revetment rocks from the beach, and remove debris from the revetment. To remove the existing, unsightly storm drain outfall, **Special Condition 5** requires the City to redirect bluff-top drainage consistent with an approved Revised Drainage Plan within 180 days of permit issuance. As conditioned, the impacts of the proposed development to the scenic qualities of the coast will be mitigated to the maximum extent feasible.

LCP and Coastal Act Policies

LCP Land Use Plan Policy 24 / Coastal Act Section 30251 states:

The scenic and visual qualities of coastal areas shall be considered and protected as a resource of public importance. Permitted development shall be sited and designed to protect public views to and along the ocean and scenic coastal areas, to minimize the alteration of natural landforms, to be visually compatible with the character of surrounding areas, and, where feasible, to restore and enhance visual quality in visually degraded areas. New development in highly scenic areas such as those designated in the California Coastline Preservation and Recreation Plan prepared by the Department of Parks and Recreation and by local government shall be subordinate to the character of its setting.

LCP Zoning Code Ordinance 9.4-4408 (Coastal View Corridors) states in relevant part:

- (b) *Development standards. The following standards shall apply to new development within coastal view corridors.*
 - (1) *structures shall be sited in order to minimize alteration of natural topography and landforms, tree removal, and grading only to the extent necessary to construct buildings*

and access roads;

(2) structures shall be sited on the least visible area of the property and screened from public view using native vegetation, as feasible;

(3) structures shall incorporate natural materials and otherwise shall blend into the natural setting;

...

(5) landscape screening and restoration shall be required to minimize the visual impact of the new development; and

...

Discussion

The proposed revetment, fill buttress, and access road significantly alter the appearance of the beach and shoreline. Some of the smaller rocks have already shifted and scattered seaward. Litter and debris such as shopping carts and concrete blocks are noticeable on the revetment. Rilling and erosion of the access road and fill buttress further degrade the natural look of the shoreline. **Exhibit 7** illustrates the visual impact of the proposed project.

A vertical seawall can be colorized and textured to match the existing bluffs in ways that are not possible with rock. Such techniques have been successful in other coastal areas, such as the Del Monte Forest Area of Monterey County. However, as discussed in Section 2.5, a vertical seawall is not a feasible alternative.

To minimize the visual impacts of the proposed development, the Commission imposes **Special Condition 1** to require the City to inspect and maintain the revetment on a regular basis. **Special Condition 1** requires the City, consistent with Coastal Act permit requirements, to remove, redeposit or reposition rock that becomes dislodged from the revetment as soon as possible after displacement occurs. The condition also requires the removal of debris, trash and any unpermitted material from the revetment. The City must take all actions necessary to discourage the placement of such material on the project site. In addition, the City must prevent any sloughing or erosion that would make the fill buttress and access road unsightly.

To remove the existing, unsightly storm drain outfall at the base of the access road, the Commission also imposes **Special Condition 5**. This condition requires the City to submit for the Executive Director's approval a Revised Drainage Plan prior to permit issuance for re-routing the existing drainage from the bluff top away from the beach and to redirect bluff-top drainage consistent with the approved plan within 180 days of permit issuance.

These measures will minimize the significant adverse visual impacts of the proposed project or the scenic quality of the coastal area to the maximum extent feasible. Therefore, the Commission finds that as conditioned, the proposed development is consistent with the visual resource protection policies of the Pacifica LCP and the Coastal Act.

2.10 Alleged Violation

Development consisting of the construction of the revetment, fill buttress, maintenance access road, and other associated improvements has taken place without the benefit of a regular coastal development permit from the Commission. Although development has taken place prior to submission of this permit

application, consideration of the application by the Commission for the portion of the development located in the Commission's original permit jurisdiction has been based solely upon the policies of the Coastal Act. Approval of the permit does not constitute a waiver of any legal action with regard to the alleged violation, nor does it constitute an admission as to the legality of any development undertaken on the subject site without a coastal development permit.

3.0 CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA)

Section 13096 of the California Code of Regulations requires Commission approval of Coastal Development Permit applications to be supported by a finding showing the application, as conditioned by any conditions of approval, to be consistent with any applicable requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Section 21080.5(d)(2)(A) of CEQA prohibits a proposed development from being approved if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen any significant adverse effects which the activity may have on the environment.

The Commission incorporates its findings on Local Coastal Program and Coastal Act consistency by reference at this point as if set forth in full. As discussed above, as conditioned, there are no feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available, beyond those required herein, that would substantially lessen any significant adverse impacts that the development may have on the environment. The findings address and respond to all public comments regarding potentially significant adverse environmental effects of the project that were received prior to preparation of the staff report. Therefore, the Commission finds that the proposed project has been conditioned to mitigate the identified impacts and can be found consistent with Local Coastal Program and Coastal Act requirements to conform to CEQA.

EXHIBITS

1. Regional map
2. Vicinity map
3. Assessor parcel map
4. Appeal by Commissioners Wan and Potter
5. Existing or historic shoreline protection in vicinity of project
6. Site plan
7. Photos of project site showing visual impact of proposed project
8. Assessor parcel map showing City and private property ownership
9. March 26, 2001 letter from David Carmany, City Manager, to Steve Scholl with enclosed plans for bluff-top improvements
10. CSA February 2002 Slope Stability Analysis

CORRESPONDENCE

1. February 13, 2001 letter from James Vreeland Jr., Mayor, to Sara Wan.
2. July 12, 2002 letter from Mary Devitt to Sara Wan

APPENDIX A: LIST OF SUBSTANTIVE FILE DOCUMENTS

- California Coastal Commission 1998. Staff report, CDP application A-3-PSB-98-049 (Tokyo Masuiwaya California Corporation), October 15, 1998.
- California Coastal Commission 1999. *Beach Erosion and Response Guidance Document*, December, 1999.
- Carmany 2001. Letter from David Carmany, City Manager, to Steve Scholl, March 26, 2001.
- Carmany 2002a. Letter from David Carmany, City Manager, to Peter T. Imhof. March 28, 2002.
- Carmany 2002b. Letter from David Carmany, City Manager, to Peter T. Imhof. July 11, 2002.
- City of Pacifica, 1998a. Application for Emergency Permit, March 20, 1998.
- City of Pacifica, 1998b. Council Agenda Summary Report. March 9, 1998.
- City of Pacifica, 1998c. Minutes of the City Council, March 9, 1998.
- City of Pacifica, 1998d. Minutes of the City Council, May 26, 1998.
- City of Pacifica, 2000a. Address list of parties notified of project.
- City of Pacifica, 2000b. Application for Coastal Development Permit, March 22, 2000.
- City of Pacifica, 2000c. Assessor Parcel Numbers of properties within 100 feet of the project.
- City of Pacifica, 2000d. Disaster Response & Recovery at Esplanade Drive, Pacifica Fire Department Building Division, February 2000.
- City of Pacifica, 2000g. Grant memo regarding Planning Commission approval, March 21, 2000.
- City of Pacifica, 2000h. Minutes of the Planning Commission, March 20, 2000.
- City of Pacifica, 2000i. Notice of Action. March 21, 2000.
- City of Pacifica, 2000j. Notice of Exemption for California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Process to Office of Planning and Research and Office of County Clerk, March 21, 2000.
- City of Pacifica, 2000k. Notice of Hearing on Proposed Permit, March 10, 2000.
- City of Pacifica, 2000l. Notice of Pending Permit, posted March 22, 2000.
- City of Pacifica, 2000m. Planning Commission Staff Report, March 20, 2000.
- City of Pacifica, 2000n. Project plans, 11" x 17".
- City of Pacifica, 2000o. Property owner list and location map.
- City of Pacifica, 2000p. Property ownership documents.
- City of Pacifica, 2000q. Reduced site plan.
- City of Pacifica 2001. General Plan. Updated March 2001.
- Clinton 1998. Letter from President Clinton to James Witt, Director, Federal Emergency Management Agency re: Declaration of major disaster in the State of California, February 9, 1998.
- Cotton, Shires, & Associates 1998a. Summary Report of Earthwork Observations, Esplanade Drive Coastal Protection Project. October 1998.

A-2-PAC-00-010, 2-00-009 (City of Pacifica)

- Cotton, Shires, & Associates 1998b. Vicinity Map, General Notes, Specifications and List of Sheets, Esplanade Drive Coastal Protection Project, As-Built Plans. October 26, 1998.
- Cotton, Shires, & Associates 2000. Response to Coastal Commission Appeal & Supplemental Information Request. October, 2000.
- Cotton, Shires, & Associates 2001a. Letter from Ted Sayre, Supervising Engineering Geologist, and Patrick Shires, Principal Geotechnical Engineer, to Scott Holmes. January 17, 2001.
- Cotton, Shires & Associates 2001b. Supplemental Reply to Coastal Commission Questions. September 18, 2001.
- Cotton, Shires & Associates 2002. Supplemental Response to the Coastal Commission regarding the Esplanade Revetment. February 2002.
- Crabtree 2000a. Letter from Michael Crabtree, City Planner, to Chris Kern. April 19, 2000.
- Crabtree 2000b. Letter from Michael Crabtree, City Planner, to Steve Scholl. May 4, 2000.
- Crabtree 2000c. Letter from Michael Crabtree, City Planner, to Steve Scholl. May 9, 2000.
- Crabtree 2001. Letter from Michael Crabtree, City Planner, to Virginia Esperanza re: Pedestrian Walkway CDP-2-00-041. February 1, 2001.
- Cull 2000. Letter from Rebecca Cull, Wildlife Biologist, EcoSystems West Consulting, to Ted Sayer re: biological review and impact assessment of Esplanade Drive Revetment Project, June 30, 2000.
- Esperanza 2000a. Letter from Virginia A. Esperanza to Scott Holmes and Ken Solomon, City of Pacifica, April 20, 2000.
- Esperanza 2000b. Letter from Virginia A. Esperanza to Ken Solomon, June 6, 2000.
- Esperanza 2000c. Letter from Virginia A. Esperanza to Ken Solomon, November 15, 2000.
- Federal Emergency Management Agency 1998. Damage Survey Report, March 5, 1998.
- Federal Emergency Management Agency 1999. Damage Survey Report, March 19, 1999.
- Fong 1998. Letter from Calvin C. Fong, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, to Ken Solomon, April 2, 1998.
- Griggs and Savoy 1985. Griggs, Gary and Lauret Savoy, editors. *Living with the California Coast. Chapter 11, San Francisco to Año Nuevo* by Kenneth Lajoie and Scott Mathieson. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1985.
- Imhof 2001. Letter from Peter T. Imhof to James M. Vreeland, Jr., Mayor. October 11, 2001.
- John Northmore Roberts & Associates 2000. Pacifica Bicycle Plan. March 2000.
- Lawrence Berkeley Lab 1996. 1996 Site Environmental Report for Ernest Orlando Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory.
- L.C. Lee & Associates 2002. Background Documentation for Coastal Bluff Ecosystem Restoration. March 7, 2002.
- Lindberg 2001. Letter from Ken Lindberg, President, Power Engineering Contractors, to Patrick Shires, CSA. November 13, 2001.

A-2-PAC-00-010, 2-00-009 (City of Pacifica)

Miller 2001. Letter from Karen Miller, Chief, Endangered Species Division, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, to Ken Solomon, January 17, 2001.

San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board, 1998. Letter from Loretta K. Barsamian to Ken Solomon, April 10, 1998.

Schimko 2001. Memorandum from Anna Shimko to Cecilia Quick, City Attorney. September 20, 2001.

Scholl 2000. Letter from Steve Scholl to Michael Crabtree, City Planner, June 23, 2000.

Scholl 2001. Letter from Steve Scholl to David Carmany, City Manager, March 6, 2001.

Silva 2000. Letter from Betty Silva, State Lands Commission, Division of Environmental Planning and Management, to Ken Solomon, March 14, 2000.

Skelly 2001. Letter from David Skelly, Skelly Engineering to Ted Sayre, CSA. November 28, 2001.

Smith 2000. Letter from Nanci Smith, Public Land Management Specialist, State Lands Commission, to Chris Kern, February 15, 2000.

Solomon 2000a. Letter from Ken Solomon, Senior Planner, to Chris Kern, March 22, 2000.

Solomon 2000b. Letter from Ken Solomon, Senior Planner, to Chris Kern, April 11, 2000.

Solomon 2000c. Letter from Ken Solomon, Senior Planner, to Steve Scholl, October 13, 2000.

Solomon 2000d. Letter from Ken Solomon, Senior Planner, to David Wright (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service) and Robert Floerke, California Department of Fish and Game, November 30, 2000.

Solomon 2001a. E-mail memo from Ken Solomon, Senior Planner, to Carl Wilcox, California Department of Fish and Game, January 8, 2001.

Solomon 2001b. Letter from Ken Solomon, Senior Planner, to Steve Scholl, January 18, 2001.

Solomon 2001c. Letter from Ken Solomon, Senior Planner, to Steve Scholl, January 23, 2001.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 1999. Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for the Pacific Coast Population of the Western Snowy Plover; Final Rule. 50 CFR Part 17, Federal Register Volume 64, Number 234, December 7, 1999.

Vreeland 2001a. Letter from James Vreeland, Jr., Mayor, to Sara Wan, February 13, 2001.

Vreeland 2001b. Letter from James Vreeland, Jr., Mayor, to Steve Scholl. September 18, 2001.

Wilson 1998. Proclamation of a State of Emergency by Governor Pete Wilson, February 4, 1998.

Vreeland 2001. Letter from James Vreeland, Jr., Mayor, to Steve Scholl. September 18, 2001.

Schimko 2001. Memorandum from Anna Shimko to Cecilia Quick, City Attorney. September 20, 2001.

A-2-PAC-00-010, 2-00-009 (City of Pacifica)

Cotton, Shires & Associates 2001. Supplemental Reply to Coastal Commission Questions. September 18, 2001,

Cotton, Shires & Associates 2002. Supplemental Response to the Coastal Commission regarding the Esplanade Revetment. February 2002.

Skelly 2001. Letter from David Skelly, Skelly Engineering to Ted Sayre, CSA. November 28, 2001.

L.C. Lee & Associates 2002. Background Documentation for Coastal Bluff Ecosystem Restoration. March 7, 2002.

Lindberg 2001. Letter from Ken Lindberg, President, Power Engineering Contractors, to Patrick Shires, CSA. November 13, 2001.

Carmany 2002. Letter from David Carmany, City Manager, to Peter T. Imhof. March 28, 2002.

Carmany 2002. Letter from David Carmany, City Manager, to Peter T. Imhof. July 11, 2002.

Imhof 2001. Letter from Peter T. Imhof to James M. Vreeland, Jr., Mayor. October 11, 2001.